arXiv:hep-ph/9307309v1 20 Jul 1993

BEYOND THE STANDARD MODEL

GRACIELA GELMINI
Department of Physics, University of California at Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024-1547

ABSTRACT

A pedagogical introduction is given to attempts to formulate a more fundamental theory of elementary particles than that provided by the standard model. After a review of the basic elements of the standard model, its unsatisfactory features, and ideas to modify them will be discussed. An introduction to Technicolour, t-quark condensates, supersymmetric models, GUT's and a brief comment on composite models follow.

1. Introduction

The success of the standard model (S.M.) as the theory of elementary particles is indisputable. This model provides the answers to many of the fundamental questions formulated in the '60's:

- Weak interactions are renormalizable when unified with electromagnetism in the Glashow-Weinberg-Salam theory[1].
- Quarks have a physical reality, as elementary particles confined into hadrons.
- A Lagrangian theory of strong interactions can be formulated; this is QCD[2].
- There is a unity in the description of particle interactions (except gravity), since they can be described by gauge theories, with the profound distinction among them depending on whether the vacuum state respects the symmetry or not.

All experimental and theoretical tests until now verify that these ideas are correct. At this point discrepancies would be more interesting than confirmations. Thus, why look for physics beyond the S.M.? The main reason is that by thinking about what may come next, we improve our chances of finding it. We may design the experimental and theoretical tests that uncover it, and we may learn how to interpret possible signatures of new physics. Another reason is that the S.M. has unsatisfactory features and leaves open questions that may be solved by further use of some of the successful ideas of the S.M., or by entirely new ideas. The main new ideas incorporated into the S.M. are:

- A new layer of compositeness: "preons" may constitute quarks, in the same way quarks constitute hadrons. Preons may even yield dynamical symmetry breaking of the electroweak symmetry (Technicolour models), repeating at higher energies the breaking of chiral symmetry at the color confinement scale.

- More symmetry: Grand Unified symmetries may repeat at higher energy scales the electroweak unification, this time unifying also strong interactions, or we may find, instead, a boson-fermion symmetry, i.e. a supersymmetry.

An example of entirely new ideas not contained in the S.M., is provided by string theories. String models are based on a radical modification of the concepts on which the S.M. rests as a local quantum field theory, since the fundamental degrees of freedom are not located at points in space-time but in one dimensional extended objects, the strings. However, effective local field theories are derived from string theories, as their low energy limit. These theories are extremely interesting. Superstring theories are the only candidates at present for a unified theory of all interactions including gravity. Unfortunately, at present, an infinite variety of gauge models and matter spectra seem to be consistent with perturbative solutions to string theories. We are very far from formulating and solving a unique, predictive string theory.

The definition of physics "beyond" the S.M. rests on what we mean by the S.M. itself. We will start these lectures, therefore, with an overview of the main features of the S.M. including a review of gauge and global interactions, exact and spontaneously broken, and the possible breaking mechanisms. We will then mention the unsatisfactory features of the S.M. and possible ways to modify them. We will review current attempts to incorporate either more symmetry or a new layer of compositeness. We will talk about the possibility of a dynamical symmetry breaking of the electroweak symmetry, both in Technicolour models (T.C.) and through top quark condensates. We will present the minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model (M.S.S.M.) and mention minimally non-minimal extensions. We will talk about grand unified theories (GUT's) and supersymmetric GUT's and we will briefly mention composite models.

These lectures follow a pedagogical approach. I will not attempt an exhaustive comparison with data.

2. The Standard Model

The S.M. is a gauge theory. Any gauge theory has three defining elements:

i) The symmetry group. It is $SU_{\mathrm{Colour}}(3) \times SU_{\mathrm{Left}}(2) \times U_Y(1)$, where Y is the weak hypercharge.

ii) The representation of the matter fields, the fermions f. There are 15 Weyl spinors, repeated twice at larger masses, yielding three generations or families (see Table 1.). In Table 1., the parentheses show the representation of $SU_C(3)$, the representation of $SU_L(2)$ (both indicated by their dimensionality), and the value of Y, for each set of fields. Here, the index $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the colour index. The sub-indices L and R indicate Weyl spinors of left and right-handed chirality (see later). Notice that the right-handed neutrinos $\nu_{e_R}, \nu_{\mu_R}, \nu_{\tau_R}$ are absent in the S.M.

(in order to prevent the appearance of Dirac neutrino masses). They could easily be added as singlets under the three groups, $\nu_R: \ (1,1,0)$.

Table 1. Matter fields in the Standard Model.

Quarks	**Leptons**
$q_L: \ (3,2,1/6)$	$\ell_L: \ (1,2,-1/2)$
$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_{Li}, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix}_{Li}, \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b \end{pmatrix}_{Li}$	$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\tau \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}_L$
$u_R: \ (3,2,2/3)$	
$u_{Ri} \ , \ c_{Ri} \ , \ t_{Ri}$	
$d_R: \ (3,1,-1/3)$	$e_R: \ (1,1,-1)$
$d_{R_i} \ , \ s_{Ri} \ , \ b_{Ri}$	$e_R \ , \ \mu_R \ , \ \tau_R$

The fields f_L (q_L and ℓ_L) have weak isospin $T_L = 1/2$, thus its third component T_{3L} is $+1/2$ and $-1/2$ for the upper and lower components respectively. The other fields, the f_R, have $T_L = 0$, thus $T_{3L} = 0$. The charge Q of each field is given by

$$Q = T_{3L} + Y \ . \tag{1}$$

The charges of the particles in each generation sum to zero, $\sum_f Q = 0$. This insures that anomalies cancel within each family and, thus, the S.M. symmetry is preserved at the quantum level. The $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ assignments of f_L and f_R make it impossible to have mass terms

$$m_f(\bar{f}_L)f_R \tag{2}$$

in the Lagrangian (since only terms that are singlet, i.e. invariant under the symmetry group, can appear in the Lagrangian).

iii) A mechanism for spontaneous symmetry breaking. In the S.M. there is a fundamental scalar particle $\phi: (1,2,-1/2)$ with a potential $V(\phi^+\phi)$ that has a minimum at

$$< \phi > \neq 0 \ . \tag{3}$$

The non-zero vacuum expectation value (V.E.V.) $< \phi >$ breaks the electroweak symmetry into electromagnetism

$$SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1) \to U_{em}(1) \tag{4}$$

and induces terms as in Eq. 2, that give masses to the quarks and leptons, except neutrinos.

Let us analyze the main features of the S.M. contained in a compact way in the three points above.

2.1. Weyl Spinors

The electroweak interactions distinguish left-handed from right-handed fermions, where the chirality components L and R of a Dirac fermion f are defined as

$$f_L = P_L f = \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2} f \ , \quad f_R = P_R f = \frac{1+\gamma_5}{2} f \ . \tag{5}$$

As we have seen above, in the S.M. the fields f_L are doublets and the fields f_R are singlets of $SU_L(2)$. This different assignment can be done because gauge interactions conserve chirality, and it is done to account for maximal parity violation in weak interaction.

A Dirac fermion f has four independent complex components; f_L and f_R are two orthogonal pieces of f, each a two-component Weyl spinor,

$$f = \frac{1+\gamma_5+1-\gamma_5}{2} = P_L f + P_R f = f_L + f_R \ . \tag{6}$$

We will frequently use the following properties of the γ-matrices[3]:

$$\gamma_5^2 = 1 \ , \quad \gamma_5^+ = \gamma_5 \ , \quad \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu = -\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \ . \tag{7}$$

We can, thus, prove that P_L and P_R are projectors (i.e. $P_L^2 = P_L, \ P_R^2 = P_R$) onto orthogonal components (i.e. $P_L P_R = P_R P_L = 0$). For example,

$$P_L^2 = \frac{(1-\gamma_5)^2}{4} = \frac{1 - 2\gamma_5 + \gamma_5^2}{4} = \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2} = P_L \ , \tag{8}$$

$$P_L \, P_R = \frac{(1-\gamma_5)}{2} \frac{(1+\gamma_5)}{2} = \frac{1-\gamma_5^2}{4} = 0 \ . \tag{9}$$

On the conjugate fermions $\bar{f} \equiv f^\dagger \gamma_0$, P_L and P_R act in the following way:

$$\bar{f} \, P_L = f^\dagger \gamma_0 P_L = f^\dagger P_R \gamma_0 = f^\dagger P_R^\dagger \gamma_0 = (P_R f)^\dagger \gamma_0 = \overline{(f_R)} \ , \tag{10}$$

$$\bar{f} \, P_R = \overline{(f_L)} \ . \tag{11}$$

We can see now that kinetic terms, $\mathcal{L}_k = i\bar{f}\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu f$, and gauge interaction terms, $\mathcal{L}_{g.i.} = g\bar{f}\gamma^\mu f A_\mu$, do not change chirality, due to the presence of γ^μ,

$$\bar{f}\gamma^\mu f = \overline{(f_L + f_R)} \gamma^\mu \, (f_L + f_R) = \overline{(f_L)}\gamma_\mu f_L + \overline{(f_R)}\gamma_\mu f_R \tag{12}$$

since the mixed terms vanish: $\overline{(f_R)}\gamma_\mu f_L = \bar{f}\,P_L\gamma^\mu\,P_R f = \bar{f}\gamma^\mu\,(P_R\,P_L)\,f = 0$.

Mass terms, instead, mix chirality. Dirac masses mix two different Weyl spinors,

$$m^D\,\bar{f}f = m^D\overline{(f_L + f_R)}\,(f_L + f_R) = m^D\left(\overline{(f_L)}f_R + \overline{(f_R)}f_L\right)\ . \tag{13}$$

Majorana masses mix a Weyl spinor with itself,

$$m^M\,(f_L)^T\,Cf_L \equiv m^M\,\overline{(f^C)_R}f_L\ . \tag{14}$$

Since here a field is mixed with its charge-conjugate, this term is only possible for particles that have zero charge of any additive conserved quantum number, such as electric charge. Let us clarify Eq. (14), and introduce concepts that will be useful later, by examining the charge conjugation C. The matrix C is defined as $C = -C^{-1} = -C^\dagger = -C^T = i\gamma^2\gamma^0$. Under charge conjugation Dirac and Weyl fermions transform in the following way (see, for example Ref. 4):

$$f \xrightarrow{C} f^C \equiv C\bar{f}^T \tag{15}$$

$$\bar{f} \xrightarrow{C} \overline{f^C} \equiv f^T\,C \tag{16}$$

$$f_L = P_L f \xrightarrow{C} P_L f^C = \left(f^C\right)_L = C\overline{(P_R f)}^T = C\overline{(f_R)}^T \tag{17}$$

$$f_R \xrightarrow{\quad C \quad} \left(f^C\right)_R = C\overline{(f_L)}^T \tag{18}$$

$$\overline{(f_L)} \xrightarrow{\quad C \quad} \overline{(f^C)_L} = (f_R)^T\,C \tag{19}$$

$$\overline{(f_R)} \xrightarrow{\quad C \quad} \overline{(f^C)_R} == (f_L)^T\,C \tag{20}$$

Notice that only two of the four Weyl spinors $f_L, f_R, \left(f^C\right)_L$ and $\left(f^C\right)_R$, are independent. Usually we choose f_L, f_R as independent (then $\left(f^C\right)_R = C\overline{(f_L)}^T$, $\left(f^C\right)_L = C\overline{(f_R)}^T$). But in GUT's it is usually better to take both independent Weyl spinors with the same chirality. For example f_L, $\left(f^C\right)_L$ (then $\left(f^C\right)_R = C\overline{(f_L)}^T$, $f_R = C\overline{(f^C)}_L^T$).

2.2. Gauge Interactions

Starting from a Lagrangian invariant under a group G of continuous global transformations, we obtain a Lagrangian invariant under local (or gauge) transformations by replacing the derivatives ∂_μ by covariant derivatives D_μ. A Lagrangian, function of fields χ_α and their derivatives $\partial_\mu\chi_\alpha$ (α labels all fields),

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\,(\chi_\alpha,\ \partial_\mu\chi_\alpha)\ , \tag{21}$$

is invariant under a global group G of transformations U, if $\mathcal{L}$, written in terms of transformed fields

$$\chi'_\alpha = U\chi_\alpha\,, \qquad \partial_\mu\chi'_\alpha = U\partial_\mu\chi_\alpha\ , \tag{22}$$

is the same function in Eq. (21) of the new fields, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\left(\chi'_\mu,\, \partial_\mu \chi'_\mu\right)$.

We obtain a gauge invariant Lagrangian by replacing

$$\partial_\mu \to D_\mu \;=\; \partial_\mu \;-\; ig \sum_a A^a_\mu T^a \;, \tag{23}$$

where A^a_μ are new fields, the gauge fields, and T^a are the generators of the group G. There are as many gauge fields as generators (both labelled by the index a). Any transformation U can be written in terms of the generators T^a as $U = \exp\{i \sum_a \alpha^a T^a\}$ where α^a are free parameters. In global transformations each α^a is a constant. In local transformations, the parameters α^a depend on space-time, $\alpha^a = \alpha^a(t, \vec{x})$.

The explicit form of the generators depends on the representation of the field to which D_μ is applied. Examples are: $T^a = \tau^a/2$ for fields that are doublets of $SU(2)$, where τ^a, $a = 1, 2, 3$, are the Pauli matrices; $T^a = \lambda^a/2$ for fields in the representation [3] of $SU(3)$, where λ^a, $a = 1, \cdots, 8$, are the Gell-Mann matrices. $SU(n)$, the group of unitary n × n matrices with determinant equal to one, has $\left(n^2 - 1\right)$ generators T^a. They obey the commutation relations

$$\left[T^a,\, T^b\right] = i\, C_{abc}\, T^c \;, \tag{24}$$

(sum on c) where C_{abc} are numbers called structure constants. For example, in $SU(2)$

$$\left[T^a,\, T^b\right] = i\, \epsilon_{abc}\, T^c \;, \tag{25}$$

where ϵ_{abc} is the completely antisymmetric tensor with three indices.

The commutation relations are characteristic of the group, and not of the particular representation. For example the generators in the representation [2] of SU(2) are

$$T^a = \frac{\tau^a}{2} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\, \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix},\, \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}\right) \;, \tag{26}$$

and in the representation [3] of SU(3) they are

$$T^a = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{bmatrix},\, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}\right) . \tag{27}$$

In both cases the generators fulfill the relations in Eq. (25). In order to obey the same commutation relations, the generators in different representations have different normalizations, i.e.

$$Tr\ \left(T^a\, T^b\right) \;=\; r\delta^{ab} \;, \tag{28}$$

where r is a representation dependent number (this is important for GUT's). For example, for $SU(2)$, $r_{[2]} = 1/2$, $r_{[3]} = 2$. Usually r is chosen to be $r = 1/2$ in the fundamental representation [n] of $SU(n)$.

The number of simultaneously diagonalizable generators, i.e. generators that commute with each other, is called the rank of a group. The set of these generators corresponds to the set of quantum numbers that can be defined for each particle. The rank of $SU(n)$ is (n−1). Thus, $SU(2)$ has only one diagonal generator, T_3, and $SU(3)$ has two, usually chosen to be T_3 and T_8. The rank of the standard model is, thus, $2 + 1 + 1 = 4$.

The gauge invariant Lagrangian derived from Eq. (21) is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = \mathcal{L}\left(\chi_\alpha,\, D_\mu \chi_\alpha\right) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{g.b.}} \;. \tag{29}$$

The last term is the Lagrangian of the gauge bosons

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{g.b.}} = -\,\frac{1}{4} \sum_a F^a_{\mu\nu}\, F^{\mu\nu a} \;, \tag{30}$$

with

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\, A^a_\nu \,-\, \partial_\nu\, A^a_\mu \,+ \mathrm{g}\; C_{abc}\, A^b_\mu\, A^c_\nu \;. \tag{31}$$

For a U(1) group, $C_{abc} = 0$. Thus, only for a $U(1)$ group there are no three-gauge-boson and four-gauge-boson couplings. Gluons and the weak gauge bosons do couple with themselves, while photons do not.

In addition to the usual term $\sum_a F^a_{\mu\nu}\, F^{\mu\nu a}$ in Eq. (30), also the term $\sum_a F^a_{\mu\nu}\, \widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu a}$, with $\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu a} = (1/2)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\, F^a_{\alpha\beta}$, is invariant under gauge transformations. Thus, except for $\mathrm{U}_Y(1)$ (for which $\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0$) we should add to the Lagrangian in Eq. (29) a term

$$\frac{\mathrm{g}\;\theta}{32\pi^2} \sum_a F^a_{\mu\nu}\, \widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu a} \tag{32}$$

for each group of the S.M. This term can be written as a total divergence, thus its contribution to the action $S = \int \mathcal{L}\; d^4x$, can be transformed into a surface integral at $|x| \to \infty$. This can be chosen to be zero (with gauge fields going to zero sufficiently fast as $|x| \to \infty$) unless non perturbative field configurations are taken into account. The existence of non-perturbative tunnelling amplitudes between different vacua (with different topological properties) yields a non-zero contribution of the term in Eq. (32) to the action. The tunnelling amplitudes are of order $exp\left(-4\pi/\mathrm{g}^2\right)$. This factor is of order 10^{-172} for SU(2). Thus, the term in Eq. (32) is irrelevant for $SU(2)$. However, it cannot be avoided for $SU(3)$, where g_3 can be of $O(1)$. This term, present in the QCD Lagrangian, violates P and CP, which implies an experimental upper bound $\theta_{\rm QCD} < 10^{-9}$ for the arbitrary parameter $\theta_{\rm QCD}$. Why is θ so small is an open problem in QCD, "the strong CP-problem", that may provide a window towards physics beyond the S.M. For example, it may require the existence of a global spontaneously broken quasi symmetry, the U(1) of Peccei and Queen[5] . We will not deal with this problem in these lectures.

The globally invariant Lagrangian for the fermions of the S.M.,

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_f \left(\bar{f}_L \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu f_L + \bar{f}_R \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu f_R\right) , \tag{33}$$

becomes a gauge invariant Lagrangian for the fermions, after replacing $\partial_\mu \to D_\mu$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_f =& \sum_f \bar{f}_L \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu - i g_2 \sum_i \left(\frac{\tau^i}{2}\right) W^i_\mu - i g_1 Y_L B_\mu\right) f_L \\
&+ \sum_f f_R \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu - i g_1 Y_R B_\mu\right) f_R \\
&+ \sum_q \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu \left(-i g_3 \sum_a \frac{\lambda^a}{2} G^a_\mu\right) q_L \\
&+ \sum_q \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu \left(-i g_3 \sum_a \frac{\lambda^a}{2} G^a_\mu\right) q_R .
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Here g_1, g_2, g_3 are the coupling constants of $\mathrm{U}_Y(1)$, $\mathrm{SU}_L(2)$ and $\mathrm{SU}_C(3)$ respectively, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $a = 1, \cdots, 8$, label the generators of $\mathrm{SU}_L(2)$ and $\mathrm{SU}_C(3)$ respectively, f indicates all fermions, while q indicates only the quarks. The last two terms correspond to $SU_C(3)$. Notice that the $SU_C(3)$ couplings are the same for the left- and right-handed quarks.

2.3. Global Symmetries

In the absence of mass terms $m_f \bar{f}_L f_R$ in the Lagrangian, f_L and f_R are not mixed. Thus, the N_L left-handed fermions with equal quantum numbers can be rotated among themselves by unitarity global $U_L(N_L)$ transformations U, since $\bar{f}_L U^{-1} U f_L = \bar{f}_L f_L$. Also the N_R massless fields f_R with equal quantum numbers can be rotated among themselves by unitarity global $U_R(N_R)$ transformations. Thus, in general, the global symmetry of a gauge fermion Lagrangian with zero masses is

$$U_L(N_L) \times U_R(N_R) = SU_L(N_L) \times U_L(1) \times SU_R(N_R) \times U_R(1) . \tag{35}$$

The generators of the groups acting only on f_L contain the projector P_L, those acting only on f_R contain P_R,

$$T^a_L = T^a\,\frac{(1-\gamma_5)}{2}, \qquad T^a_R = T^a\,\frac{(1+\gamma_5)}{2}\ . \tag{36}$$

The vector and axial-vector diagonal groups have, respectively, the generators

$$T^a_V = T^a_L + T^a_R = T^a, \qquad T^a_A = T^a_R - T^a_L = T^a\gamma_5\ . \tag{37}$$

In order to obtain these diagonal generators we need $N_L = N_R = N$. In the actual world, the approximation $m_u = m_d = 0$ yields predictions which are good to a few percent, thus the QCD Lagrangian (neglecting the electroweak interactions) has an approximate global symmetry with $N = 2$, $U_L(2) \times U_R(2)$. If also $m_s = 0$ is assumed, the predictions are only good to a few 10 %, since the s quark is heavier than the u or d, and $N = 3$.

The four global symmetries of massless fermions are very different. $U_V(1)$ is a conserved symmetry, the baryon number in QCD. $U_A(1)$ is instead, anomalous, i.e. not a true symmetry once quantum corrections are taken into account. The $SU_V(N)$ symmetry shows explicitly in degenerate multiplets of particles. This is the strong-isospin $SU(2)$ symmetry (that shows in doublet or triplet multiplets of almost degenerate particles, such as $(p,\, n)$, (K^+K^0), $(\pi^+\,\pi^-\,\pi^0)$, etc.) or the flavour $SU(3)$ symmetry of the "eightfold way"[6] (that shows in octets and tenplets of almost degenerate particles). The axial $SU_A(N)$ is, instead, spontaneously broken. It is believed that the light quarks condense in the vacuum,

$$\langle 0|\bar{u}_L\,\bar{u}_R|0\rangle = \langle 0|\bar{d}_L\,d_R|0\rangle = \cdots \neq 0\ \ , \tag{38}$$

at an energy scale close to Λ_{QCD}, where the strong coupling constant α_s becomes of $O(1)$ (see Fig. 1.)

Fig. 1. Behavior of the strong coupling constant $\alpha_s(q^2)$ *vs.* q^2, the square momentum transfer, showing the regions of asymptotic freedom, chiral symmetry breaking and confinement.

The quark bilinears in Eq. (38) are not $SU_A(N)$ singlets, thus, their non-zero V.E.V. break chiral symmetry spontaneously in to the vector diagonal group, $SU_L(N) \times SU_R(N) \rightarrow SU_V(N)$. The spontaneous breaking of a global symmetry is signaled by the appearance of a zero mass boson, called a Nambu- Goldstone boson [7], for each broken generator. For the broken symmetry $SU_A(2)$ of the QCD Lagrangian, these bosons are the three pions, π^+, π^0, π^-. Because the light quark masses are actually non-zero, $SU_A(N)$ is only an approximate symmetry, whose spontaneous violation yields "quasi" Goldstone bosons, i.e. bosons with a small mass (see below). Thus, the pion mass m_π is non-zero, but it is still much smaller than all other hadronic masses.

2.4. Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking

A spontaneously broken global symmetry is a symmetry of the Lagrangian that is not respected by the vacuum state. Let us see explicitly the appearance of zero mass bosons in a simple example. Consider a complex scalar field $\phi = (\phi_R + i\phi_I)/\sqrt{2}$ and a Lagrangian that is invariant under $U(1)$ transformations of ϕ, i.e. under the multiplication of ϕ by a phase

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi' = e^{i\alpha}\phi \ . \tag{39}$$

The most general renormalizable Lagrangian, invariant under the transformation in Eq. (39) is

$$\mathcal{L} = \partial^\mu \phi^\dagger \partial_\mu \phi - V\left(\phi^\dagger \phi\right) \ , \tag{40}$$

with

$$V\left(\phi^\dagger \phi\right) = - m^2 \phi^2 \phi + \lambda \left(\phi^\dagger \phi\right)^2 \ . \tag{41}$$

While the condition of having V bounded from below for large values of ϕ imposes $\lambda > 0$, the quadratic term could have a positive or negative coefficient. If $m^2 < 0$, there would be only one minimum of V, at $\phi = 0$, and $U(1)$ would be a manifest symmetry. We are interested in the case $m^2 > 0$. The minimum of the potential corresponds to

$$\phi^\dagger \phi = \frac{v^2}{2} = \frac{m^2}{2\lambda} \ . \tag{42}$$

Any point in this "orbit" of degenerate minima in the plane ϕ, $\phi^\dagger$ is an equally good minimum (See Fig. 2). The system will choose one of these points and we choose the axis of real values of ϕ passing through it. Thus, without loss of generality the vacuum is at

$$\langle\phi\rangle = \frac{\langle\phi_R\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \ . \tag{43}$$

Notice that the curvature along the imaginary axis is zero, since this is the curvature of the orbit of degenerate minima, i.e.

$$m_{\phi_I} = 0 \ . \tag{44}$$

ϕ_I is, thus, the Nambu- Goldstone[7] boson in this example.

Fig. 2. The potential in Eq. (41), for $m^2 > 0$

Alternatively, we could parameterize ϕ in "polar coordinates" (this is called the "unitary gauge"),

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[v + \rho(x) \right] e^{i\xi(x)/v} \ . \tag{45}$$

By replacing Eq. (45) in the potential, Eq. (41), we can explicitly find that

$$m_\xi = 0 \ . \tag{46}$$

Thus, $\xi(x)$ is the Nambu- Goldstone boson in this case. Notice that for small values of $\xi(x)$ we have $\phi \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(v + \rho(x) + i\xi(x) \right)$ and $\xi(x) = \phi_I(x)$.

If the global symmetry is only an approximate symmetry, i.e. if there are small terms in the Lagrangian that do not respect the global symmetry, the orbit of minima is no longer flat but slightly deformed. Thus the curvature of the potential in a direction tangent to the orbit of minima is non-zero. This curvature is the mass of the Nambu- Goldstone boson. Instead of a zero mass Nambu- Goldstone boson, we have a "pseudo" or "quasi" Nambu- Goldstone boson with a small mass. Pions are quasi-Goldstone bosons, as we mentioned above.

When a global spontaneously broken symmetry is gauged, something amazing happens. The Nambu- Goldstone bosons disappear as physical particles, they are incorporated into ("eaten up" by) the gauge bosons that become massive. This is the "Higgs effect"[8] . Let us see it happening in our $U(1)$ example. Let us replace

$$\partial_\mu \to D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\mathrm{g}\, A_\mu \tag{47}$$

in the globally invariant Lagrangian in Eq. (40). Thus,

$$D_\mu\, \phi = \frac{e^{i\xi/v}}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\partial_\mu \rho - i\,(v+\rho)\; \mathrm{g} \left(A_\mu - \frac{\partial_\mu \xi}{v\mathrm{g}} \right) \right] \; . \tag{48}$$

Define the new gauge field

$$B_\mu = A_\mu - \frac{\partial_\mu \xi}{v\mathrm{g}} \; . \tag{49}$$

Thus, the term $(D_\mu \phi)^\dagger\, D_\mu \phi$ contains a term

$$-i^2\, \mathrm{g}^2\, v^2\, B_\mu\, B^\mu \; . \tag{50}$$

and $\xi(x)$ is entirely eliminated from the Lagrangian. From Eq. (50) we see that B_μ is massive

$$m_B = \mathrm{g} v \; . \tag{51}$$

In Eq. (49) we see that the massive gauge boson B_μ incorporates $\partial_\mu \xi$ (as a longitudinal component, besides the two transverse components in A_μ).

Let us return to the three pions, π^+, π^0, π^-, as the pseudo- Nambu- Goldstone bosons of the global axial $SU_L(2)$ approximate symmetry of the QCD Lagrangian. This symmetry is spontaneously broken by the non-zero V.E.V. of quark bilinear operators in Eq. (38), of the form

$$\langle 0 | \bar{q}_L\, q_R | 0 \rangle \; , \tag{52}$$

since $(\bar{q}_L\, q_R)$ is not invariant under axial transformations

$$q \to e^{-i\alpha_a \gamma_5 T^a} q \; , \tag{53}$$

as we will now prove. An axial transformation on the Dirac field q, corresponds to transforming q_L and q_R with opposite phases,

$$q_R \to e^{i\alpha_a T^a}\, q_R \; , \quad q_L \to e^{-i\alpha_a T^a}\, q_L \; . \tag{54}$$

It is easy to see that it is so, by considering only infinitesimal transformations, since any finite transformation can be obtained by a succession of infinitesimal ones. Let us, thus, consider axial transformations by infinitesimal phases $(\delta\alpha)_a$ and see that right and left-handed fields are rotated by opposite phases:

$$\begin{aligned} q \to & q + i(\delta\alpha)_a \gamma_5 T^a q = (q_R + q_L) + i(\delta\alpha)_a \gamma_5 \left[\frac{1+\gamma_5}{2} + \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2}\right] q \\ & = (q_R + i(\delta\alpha)_a T^a q_R) + (q_L - i(\delta\alpha)_a T^a q_L) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Now, using Eq. (54) we see that $\bar{q}_L q_R$ is not invariant under axial rotations,

$$\bar{q}_L q_R \to \overline{(e^{-i\alpha_a T^a} q_L)} \left(e^{i\alpha_a T^a} q_R\right) = \bar{q}_L e^{2i\alpha_a T^a} q_R \ . \tag{56}$$

We also know that in the S.M., $(\bar{q}_L q_R)$ is not invariant under electroweak transformations. Thus, the non-zero V.E.V.'s in Eq. (38) not only break the global chiral symmetry spontaneously, but they also break the gauge symmetry $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ spontaneously. If there would be no other electroweak breaking mechanism (i.e. no Higgs field), the $\bar{q}_L q_R$ condensates would give mass to the $W^\pm$ and Z, at their energy scale

$$m_{W^\pm, Z} \simeq \Lambda_{\rm QCD} \simeq 100\,{\rm MeV} \ . \tag{57}$$

and the three pions π^+, π^0, π^- would be "eaten up" by the weak gauge bosons of the same charge. This mechanism for electroweak dynamical symmetry breaking is at the basis of Technicolour models. The breaking is called "dynamical" because the condensates form as the result of interactions as their coupling constant becomes of order one, in this case, colour interactions (see Fig. 1.).

2.5. Spontaneous Electroweak Breaking in the Standard Model

In the S.M., the electroweak spontaneous breaking is done by introducing a fundamental complex colour singlet scalar ϕ, that is a doublet of $\mathrm{SU}_L(2)$ and carries weak hypercharge $Y_\phi = -1/2$. Both the field ϕ and its conjugate, $\tilde{\phi} = i\tau^2\phi^*$, are used

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^0 \\ \phi^- \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad \tilde{\phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ -\bar{\phi}^0 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{58}$$

These fields are coupled in a gauge invariant way,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm Higgs} = (D^\mu \phi)^\dagger D_\mu \phi - V(\phi^\dagger \phi) \ , \tag{59}$$

with an ad-hoc potential as in Eq. (41) (where now ϕ is a doublet), that has a non-zero V.E.V. given by Eq. (42). Since $\phi^\dagger \phi = \tilde{\phi}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}$, it is equivalent to write the Lagrangian in terms of ϕ or $\tilde{\phi}$. The component of ϕ with non-zero V.E.V. is a singlet under a $U(1)$ symmetry. This $U(1)$ is, therefore, preserved as an unbroken symmetry, and it is identified with electromagnetism, $U_{\rm em}(1)$. Thus,

$$\langle\phi\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \langle\phi^0\rangle \\ \langle\phi^-\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v/\sqrt{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{60}$$

where $v = (m^2/\lambda)^{1/2}$, (see Eq. 42) given the parameters of the potential in Eq. (41). Since ϕ^0 has zero electric charge, $< \phi^0 > \neq 0$ does not break U_{em} (1). The photon remains massless, and the Higgs mechanism gives masses to the other gauge bosons,

$$m^2_{W^\pm} = \frac{g_2^2 v^2}{4} \ , \quad m_{Z^0} = (g_1^2 + g_2^2)\frac{v^2}{4} = \frac{m^2_W}{\cos^2\theta_W} \ . \tag{61}$$

The spontaneous symmetry breaking also gives origin to all fermion masses through the Yukawa couplings,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \Big[(\lambda_u)_{\alpha\beta} \ \bar{q}_{L\alpha} \, \phi \, u_{R\beta} + (\lambda_d)_{\alpha\beta} \ \bar{q}_{L\alpha} \tilde{\phi} d_{R\beta+} + (\lambda_\ell)_{\alpha\beta} \ \bar{\ell}_{L\alpha} \tilde{\phi} e_{R\beta} \Big] \ , \tag{62}$$

where $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3$ are generation indices and $(\lambda_f)_{\alpha\beta}$ are coupling constants. The fermion mass matrices are

$$(m_f)_{\alpha\beta} = (\lambda_f)_{\alpha\beta} \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \ . \tag{63}$$

In Eqs. (61) and (63) we see that v fixes the scale of all the masses in the S.M. From Eq. (61), given the masses of the W and Z, fields, we obtain

$$v \ \simeq \ 250 GeV \ . \tag{64}$$

3. Unsatisfactory Features of the Standard Model

Let us enumerate those features most used against taking the S.M. as the ultimate elementary particle theory.

3.1. Too Many Free Parameters

There are 19 parameters, if $\nu' s$ are massless. They are:

- 3 coupling constants g_1, g_2, g_3 or α, θ_W, Λ_{QCD};
- 2 parameters of the Higgs potential v and λ, or m_{Z^0} and m_{Higgs};
- 9 fermion masses: m_e, m_μ, m_τ; m_u, m_c, m_t; m_d, m_s, m_b;
- 3 mixing angles and 1 phase in the Kobayashi-Maskawa[9] matrix;
- the vacuum parameter of QCD, θ_{QCD}.

There are several more if $m_\nu \neq 0$. But, how many parameters are acceptable in a fundamental theory? This is more a philosophy question than a physics question. Still, the goal is to explain as much as possible with the least number of parameters.

3.2. The Mass Scale v is Not "Natural":

A naturally small quantity is a quantity whose small value has a symmetry reason, i.e., the symmetry of the system would increase if it were zero. We said that the only mass scale in the S.M. is v. This is true in the sense that all masses are proportional to v. However, there is another relevant scale, a scale $\Lambda >> v$. The S.M. can not be a good theory for arbitrarily large energies, thus there must be a cut-off energy scale, Λ. Since gravity is not included in the S.M., there is for sure a cut-off at $\Lambda \simeq M_{\mathrm{Planck}} \simeq 10^{19}$ GeV. If there is new physics below the quantum gravity scale (such as GUT's, or Technicolour, etc.), Λ may be lower. Thus,

$$v << \Lambda \tag{65}$$

leads to two questions:

i) Why does v have the value it has?

ii) Assuming we give v the value it has at tree level, is Eq. (65) a stable condition? In fact, one expects $v^2 \rightarrow v^2 + \Lambda^2$, due to radiative corrections. This is because radiative corrections to the Higgs mass, $m = v/\sqrt{\lambda}$, from gauge (and gravitational) interactions are quadratically divergent

$$\delta m^2 \;\simeq\; g^2 \int_0^\Lambda \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4 k^2} \;\simeq\; O(\alpha^2)\Lambda^2 \;, \tag{66}$$

where $\alpha = g^2/4\pi$.Thus $\delta v^2 \;\sim \Lambda^2\lambda$. Call v_0 the tree level value, thus

$$v^2 = v_0^2 - \lambda\Lambda^2 \;. \tag{67}$$

In order to obtain $v \simeq 250$ GeV we would use a trick similar to that used in renormalization, namely, we assign to the bare mass $m_0^2 = v_0^2/\lambda$ the value necessary to obtain the result we want,

$$\lambda(m_0^2 - \delta m^2) = \lambda\left[O(\Lambda^2) - O(\Lambda^2)\right] \simeq (250\ GeV^2) \;. \tag{68}$$

Assuming $\Lambda \simeq 10^{16}$ GeV, a typical GUT scale, we assume in Eq. (68) that two quantities of order 10^{32} almost cancel each other to produce a result of order 10^4. This is a fine-tuning by 28 orders of magnitude!

Two solutions to this problem have been proposed. One of them consists of eliminating the Higgs field altogether, relying on a dynamical mechanism to break spontaneously the electroweak symmetry. The only mechanism of this type we know is the chiral symmetry breaking by quark bilinear condensates $< \bar{q}q >$ due to colour interaction. We have seen that this mechanism would produce a mass of $O(\Lambda_{QCD})$ for the $W^{\pm}$ and the Z. Thus, one could consider a repetition of this mechanism at a larger scale Λ_{TC}, where condensates $< \bar{F}F >$ of new fermions, the "Technifermions", would form due to new interactions, "Technicolour" interactions[10].

The second proposal cures the problem ii) by introducing a fermion-boson symmetry, a "supersymmetry" [11]. Then, fermion loops contribute to radiative corrections exactly the same as bosons do, but with the opposite sign (due to Fermi-statistics). Thus

$$\delta m^2_{\text{Fermions}} \;\simeq\; -g_y^2 \int^{\Lambda} \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^4 k^2} \;\simeq\; -O(\alpha_y)\Lambda^2 \;. \tag{69}$$

where g_y are Yukawa-type couplings, that, due to supersymmetry coincide with gauge couplings g. The cancellation $\delta m^2_{\text{bosons}} - \delta m^2_{\text{fermions}} = 0$, would be exact with an exact supersymmetry that guarantees equal masses for bosons and femions, $m_b = m_f$. However, supersymmetry must be broken, since we have not observed the supersymmetric partners of the standard particles. Thus

$$\delta m^2 = O(\alpha)|m_b^2 - m_f^2|. \tag{70}$$

If, the mass differences are

$$|m_b - m_f| \leq O(1\ TeV) \quad , \tag{71}$$

then v is stable. Eq. (70) means that we should find supersymmetric partners with $m \leq O(1\ TeV)$, if supersymmetry answers the question ii) above. Notice that supersymmetry does not necessarily explain why v has the value it has in the first place.

3.3. The Interactions are Not Unified

The gauge group $SU_C(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ has three factors, thus three independent couplings constants. Can the idea of unification contained in the electroweak unification go further? Grand Unification[12, 4] proposes the existence of a simple symmetry group G that breaks spontaneously into the S.M. group at a large energy scale Λ_{GUT}. Supporting evidence for GU comes from renormalizations: the three running coupling constants tend to become less different as the energy scale increases. Since $\Lambda_{GUT} >> v$, GUT's suffer from the problem of naturality of v, or "gauge hierarchy problem". Supersymmetry may be invoked to solve this problem, yielding supersymmetric GUT's [13].

3.4. There is No Reason for the Existence of Three Families

Proposals to explain the existence of three families and their mass hierarchy have been made following one of the two guiding principles mentioned above, i.e., either more symmetry or another layer of compositeness. "Horizontal" or "inter-familiar" symmetries have the three fermions of equal quantum numbers as members of a multiplet. The horizontal symmetry group G_H is independent of the "vertical" or "intra-familiar" group G_V, so that the total gauge group is $G_V \times G_H$. The names "vertical" and "horizontal" stem from our habit to write the families in columns. G_V could be the S.M. or a vertical G.U. group. G_H could be $SU(2)$ or $SU(3)$ [14], for example. In these models the inter-familiar mass hierarchy is due to the spontaneous symmetry breaking of G_H. Realistic mass matrices can only be obtained with very complicated schemes. Also "vertical-horizontal" Grand Unifications have been proposed with large unification groups, such as $SO(16)$ or $SO(18)$ in rather baroque models [15]. We will not talk about this approach here.

In composite models, quarks and leptons are bound states of sub-components, that may have different names, one of them being "preons". In these models the family replication at higher mass scales is explained by the existence of excited levels of the bound states of preons.

3.5. Gravity is Not Included

General relativity can be formulated as a classical field theory, but attempts to quantize it yield a non-renormalizable theory. The hope is to unify gravity with other forces in such a way that the infinities arising in different sectors cancel among themselves, yielding a combined finite or renormalizable theory. The hope is that also in the same theory there will be an explanation for why the cosmological constant is so small. The best candidate at present for such a unification is provided by local-supersymmetry, that includes gravity automatically, and is thus, called "supergravity" [16]. Supergravity is one of the features of superstring models.

3.6. The S.M. Does Not Provide Dark Matter Particle Candidates

Dark matter (D.M.), the most abundant form of matter in the universe, constitutes 90 to 99% of the total mass. Its density in units of the critical density, $\Omega_{\rm D.M.}$, is known to be between 0.2 and 1, while the luminous regions in the universe account only for a fraction $\Omega_{\rm lum} \simeq 0.01$ of the critical density [17]. The nature of the D.M. is one of the most important open questions in physics and astrophysics. It may consist of nucleonic matter in the form of very low mass stars, the brown dwarfs, too small to shine, or remnants of dead stars, or primordial black holes. There are current searches trying to detect some of these objects in the dark halo of our galaxy [18]. The upper bound on nucleonic matter coming from nucleosynthesis in the early universe, makes it very difficult to have much more than $\Omega \simeq 0.1$ in nucleonic D.M.[19]. This bound strongly suggests that, even if non-shining objects made of nucleonic matter may account for the dark halos of galaxies, nucleonic

D.M. may not be enough to account for the larger amount of D.M. bound to larger scales (clusters and super-clusters of galaxies). Thus, if one believes in nucleosynthesis bounds, the bulk of the D.M. should consist of more exotic types of matter, such as new neutral massive elementary particles. The only possible such particles contained in the S.M. are neutrinos, but, in the S.M. they are massless. Thus, to provide for D.M. particle candidates the S.M. must be extended. The good news is that most extensions of the S.M. easily provide potential D.M. candidates. Let us see why.

To give the right mass to the light neutrinos seems the easiest way to get a D.M. candidate. The present relic abundance in number of the three neutrino species of the S.M. is fixed by their thermal history. Thus, if the sum of the masses of all three neutrinos is $\simeq 10 - 30$ eV they will account for $\Omega \simeq 1$ [17].

Most extensions of the S.M. predict neutral heavy stable particles with masses in the GeV-TeV range and interactions of the weak order. The amazing fact is that particles with these characteristics have $\Omega \simeq 1$ and are, thus, "natural" D.M. candidates. These particles are generally called WIMP's, Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (by opposition, astrophysical D.M. candidates are called MACHO's, Massive Compact Halo Objects). For WIMP's the relic abundance turns out to be [17]

$$\Omega h^2 \simeq 1 \cdot 10^{-37} cm^2 < \sigma_a v >^{-1} \ , \tag{72}$$

where $h = 0.4 - 1$ is the Hubble constant in units of 100 Km/Mpc sec., and $< \sigma_a v >$ is the thermal average of the annihilation cross section by the relative velocity of the WIMP's. Eq. (72) holds in most models, even if it can be modified by a non-zero cosmic asymmetry in WIMP - anti WIMP number, or by generating entropy (mainly photons) after WIMP's annihilate.

Using order of magnitude and dimensional arguments on the annihilation cross section, it is easy to to determine the range of masses for which WIMP's could have the abundance adequate to be D.M. candidates. For non-relativistic particles lighter than the Z and W weak gauge bosons (or other exchanged particles of similar mass), dimensional arguments yield roughly $\sigma_a \simeq G_F^2 \ m^2 \ N_a$, for the annihilation cross section. Here G_F is the Fermi coupling constant, m is the mass of the WIMP, and N_a is the number of annihilation channels. Thus, $\sigma_a \simeq 0.4 \ N_a \ 10^{-37} cm^2 \ (m/1GeV)^2$ and

$$\Omega h^2 \simeq O(1 - 10)(m/1 \ GeV)^{-2} \ , \tag{73}$$

the density decreases with increasing mass. WIMP's with these interactions must have masses of the order of 1 to 100 GeV to account for $\Omega_{\rm D.M.}$. WIMP's much heavier than the weak gauge bosons (or any other exchanged particles) have "electromagnetic like" cross sections (since the mass of the exchanged particle can be neglected). Dimensional arguments yield, in this case, $\sigma_a \simeq \alpha^2 N_a / m^2 \simeq$

$0.2\ N_a\ 10^{-37} cm^2\ (m/1\ TeV)^{-2}$, where α is the electromagnetic coupling constant. Therefore, the density increases with increasing mass,

$$\Omega h^2 \simeq O(1-10)(m/1\ TeV)^2\ . \qquad (74)$$

D.M. candidates with these interactions must have masses of the order of 1 to 100 TeV.

Results from LEP, combined with other bounds on D.M. have rejected several of the WIMP D.M. candidates proposed up to now[20], but many remain viable. One of the preferred D.M. candidates is still the LSP, the lightest supersymmetric particle, in supersymmetric models, as we will see later.

3.7. Additional Windows into Physics Beyond the Standard Model

Several other open problems may require physics beyond the S.M. We have mentioned one of them already, the strong CP problem[5]. Others are the solar neutrino problem[21] and the atmospheric neutrino problem[22]. Possible solutions may require a see-saw mechanism[23] to obtain very small neutrino masses ($m_\nu\ \simeq\ 10^{-3}\ eV$ or $m_\nu \simeq 10^{-1}\ eV$). We will return to these two problems later. Still another open question is the origin of the baryon number (B) asymmetry in the universe, i.e., the fact that we live in a world of matter only (with no antimatter). Producing a B-asymmetry requires B and CP violation in a situation of non-thermal equilibrium[17]. It seems impossible to generate the needed B-asymmetry just within the S.M. Trivial extensions with more than one Higgs field may work. There are many possible solutions beyond the S.M.

4. Technicolour

This is a generic name for models[10] in which the electroweak breaking is assumed to happen as the spontaneous symmetry breaking of the axial flavour symmetry in QCD.

In QCD quarks, q, are subjected to a gauge binding force, colour, associated to a gauge symmetry $SU_C(3)$. In Technicolour (T.C.) models, Technifermions, F, are subjected to a gauge binding force, Technicolour. Different T.C. symmetry groups have been proposed, for example $SU_{\rm TC}(N_{TC})$ or $SO_{\rm TC}(N_{TC})$ with $N_{TC} \geq 2$. In QCD, when the colour interaction becomes strong enough, at a scale $\Lambda_{QCD} \simeq 200$ MeV, condensates of a pair of quarks appear, like Cooper-pairs in the BCS theory of superconductivity,

$$< \bar{q}q > \simeq\ O(\Lambda^3_{QCD})\ . \qquad (75)$$

Notice that the mass dimension of $(\bar{q}q)$ is 3 (3/2 for each fermion). This explains Eq. (75), given that the only mass scale in QCD is Λ_{QCD}.

The same is assumed to happen in T.C. models, in which Technifermions condensate but at a scale $\Lambda_{TC} >> \Lambda_{QCD}$,

$$< \bar{F}F > \simeq\ O(\Lambda^3_{TC})\ . \qquad (76)$$

As we mentioned above, in the absence of any other electroweak symmetry breaking the three pions would be "eaten up" by the $W^\pm$ and Z, through the Higgs mechanism. In this case $m_{W^\pm,Z} \sim f_\pi$, for example $m_{W^\pm} = g_2 f_\pi/2 \simeq 30\ MeV$, obviously much too low. To get the actual value for $m_{W^\pm,Z}$, we would need f_π to be $\simeq 250 GeV$ instead of its actual value of $93 MeV$. In Technicolour models the $W^\pm$ and Z bosons "eat up" Technipions, $T\pi$, and acquire a mass

$$m_{W^\pm,Z} \sim f_{T\pi}\ , \tag{77}$$

in which $f_{T\pi}$ replaces f_π. Therefore, $f_{T\pi}$ should be of the order of the Higgs field V.E.V. v in the S.M., $f_{T\pi} \simeq v \simeq 250\ GeV$. Since $\Lambda_{QCD} \simeq 2f_\pi \simeq 200 MeV$, a similar relation is assumed for the T.C. counterparts

$$\Lambda_{TC}\ \simeq\ 2f_{T\pi}\ \simeq\ 500\ GeV\ . \tag{78}$$

Let us describe the simplest T.C. model[10]. The gauge group is,

$$SU_{TC}(N_{TC}) \times SU_C(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)\ , \tag{79}$$

where $N_{TC} \geq 2$, the number of Technicolours, is left as a free parameter. The group $SU_{TC}(N_{TC})$ yields an asymptotically free gauge interaction that confines at Λ_{TC}. The minimal Technifermion content is just one generation of Techniquarks Q:

$$(N_{TC},1,2,0) : \begin{pmatrix} U_L \\ D_L \end{pmatrix}_{1,2,\cdots,N} \qquad \begin{matrix} (N_{TC},1,1,1/2) & : U_{R\ 1,2,\cdots,N} \\ (N_{TC},1,1,-1/2) & : D_{R\ 1,2\cdots,N} \end{matrix} \tag{80}$$

Notice that with $Q = T_3 + Y$ we get $Q_U = 1/2, Q_D = -1/2$. Thus the sum of all electric charges is zero, and the model is anomaly free. If $m_U = m_D = 0$ there is a flavour Techni-isospin global symmetry $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$. The condensates

$$< \bar{U}_L U_R > = < \bar{U}_R U_L > = < \bar{D}_L D_R > = < \bar{D}_R D_L > \simeq O(\Lambda^3_{TC}) \tag{81}$$

break spontaneously the entire axial global $SU_A(2)$ and also break the electroweak gauge symmetry $SU(2) \times U(1)$ into $U_{em}(1)$. The Nambu- Goldstone bosons $T\pi^\pm$ and $T\pi^0$ are eaten up by the $W^\pm$ and the Z^0 respectively, so that

$$m_{W^\pm} = \frac{g_2}{2}\ f_{T\pi^\pm}\ ,\ \ m_{Z^0} = \frac{g_2\ f_{T\pi^0}}{2\cos\theta_{\text{weak}}}\ \ . \tag{82}$$

The global Techni-isospin group $SU_V(2)$ is not spontaneously broken. It is a manifest symmetry that implies, for example, $f_{T\pi^\pm} = f_{T\pi^0}$. Thus the ratio $(m_{W^\pm}/m^0_Z)$ is the same as in the S.M. Thus $\rho = 1$ is a consequence of a residual global symmetry . This is a very elegant way to give masses to the W and Z.

Problems arise when trying to give masses to the standard fermions. In the S.M., these fermions receive masses through the Yukawa couplings to the Higgs field, Eq. (62),

$$\mathcal{L}_y = \lambda \bar{f}_L f_R \phi \quad , \tag{83}$$

when $< \phi >= v \neq 0$. Here we have $< \bar{Q}Q > \neq 0$. Thus the obvious idea is to replace ϕ by $\bar{Q}Q$ in Eq. (83),

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = \lambda \bar{f}_L f_R \bar{Q}_L Q_R \quad . \tag{84}$$

This is a non-renormalizable four-fermion interaction, of the type encountered in weak interactions at scales $q << m_W$. We envisage the same situation here, and interpret Eq. (84) as the effective interaction resulting at low energies from the exchange of a heavy gauge boson, with mass M_{ETC}. These bosons mediate interactions between fermions and Technifermions. Since they are massive, they must be the gauge bosons of a spontaneously broken gauge interaction, called Extended Technicolour (E.T.C.) [24]. Consequently, from Eq. (84) we get

$$m_f \simeq \frac{< \bar{Q}Q >}{M_{ETC}^2} \ , \tag{85}$$

where the factor M_{ETC}^2 comes from a bosonic propagator at low energies, as can be seen by rewriting Eq. (84) using a Fierz-transform as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = (\bar{f}\gamma_\mu Q) \frac{1}{M_{ETC}^2} (\bar{Q}\gamma^\mu f) \ . \tag{86}$$

Thus, we have to assume a larger gauge group G_{ETC} somehow broken spontaneously into the group in Eq.(79). In most E.T.C. models, the E.T.C. generators commute with the S.M. ones, i. e. the E.T.C. gauge bosons are $SU_C(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ singlets. In this case we need at least one full generation of Technifermions, each one giving mass to the corresponding fermion with the same flavour. If the E.T.C. generators do not commute with the S.M. generators, the E.T.C. group and the S.M. group should be unified into a larger group with a unique coupling constant. However, since the couplings of the S.M. are very small at 500 GeV, while $\alpha_{ETC} \simeq O(1)$, one can unify them only by introducing hugely different mass scales, a new gauge hierarchy problem as bad as the one we wanted to avoid in the first place.

The E.T.C. interactions connect fermions from the three light generations, with Technifermions, namely, light fermions and Technifermions are in one multiplet of the E.T.C. group. Thus E.T.C. interactions also produced flavour changing neutral currents (FCNC) among the standard fermions, which yield important lower bounds on the E.T.C. gauge boson masses.

The most restrictive bounds are those on FCNC in $\Delta s = 2$ operators, such as

$$\frac{1}{M_{ETC}^2} \ \bar{s} \ d \ \bar{s} d \tag{87}$$

which contribute to the $K_L - K_S$ mass difference, impose[25]

$$M_{ETC} > 500\ TeV\ . \tag{88}$$

If the G_{ETC} is broken in one stage, there is only one mass scale M_{ETC}. Just using dimensional arguments we obtain a naive estimate for $< \bar{Q}Q >$, Eq. (76), namely

$$< \bar{Q}Q > \simeq\ \Lambda_{TC}^3\ . \tag{89}$$

Eqs. (85), (88) and (89), imply the upper bound $m_f < 0.5\ MeV$, too low for most fermion masses.

Recent attempts to raise the upper bound on m_f are based on obtaining values larger than Eq. (89) for $< \bar{Q}Q >$, of the form

$$< \bar{Q}Q > \simeq\ \Lambda_{TC}^3 \left(\frac{M_{ETC}}{\Lambda_{TC}} \right)^\gamma\ , \tag{90}$$

with $\gamma > 0$. In asymptotically free theories the running coupling constant approaches zero as the momentum transfer $q^2 \to \infty$, $\alpha_s \to 0$ ($\alpha_s = 0$ is an ultraviolet fixed point). In "walking" or "stagnant" T.C. models [25, 26, 27], the rate at which the running coupling constant approaches zero at large q^2 is decreased. If the evolution stops all together, one says that the coupling constant "stands". When it decreases with q^2 but not as fast as a running coupling, one says that the coupling constant "walks". A larger value of the coupling constant α_{TC} as q^2 increases leads to the formation of larger condensates. In order to alter considerably the running of α_s towards zero one needs to either introduce a large number $n_f >> 2$ of Techniquarks Q in the fundamental representation of $SU(N_{TC})$, or take just two flavours $n_f = 2$ of Techniquarks Q but in a very large representation of $SU(N_{TC})$. In these models one obtains $\gamma \leq\ 1$, which yields a bound $m_f < 0.5\ GeV$, still too low to account for the c, b, and t quarks.

To obtain larger values of γ one needs a "strong" E.T.C. interaction[27, 28], i.e., not only $\alpha_{TC} \simeq O(1)$ is required, but also $\alpha_{ETC} \simeq O(1)$, so that E.T.C. interactions help the T.C. interactions in the formation of the $< \bar{Q}Q >$ condensates. Here a fine tuning of α_{ETC} is required, so that E.T.C. does not replace T.C. altogether (otherwise one obtains $m_{W^\pm,Z} \simeq M_{ETC}$!). In "strong" E.T.C. models, one obtains $\gamma \leq 2$, which yields the acceptable bound $m_f < 500 GeV$. Still, there are usually some additional problems in these models, such as $\rho \neq 1$, or an incorrect m_t/m_b ratio, and the prediction of light scalar bound states.

If the E.T.C. group is broken in several stages at different scales $M_1 > M_2 > M_3$ etc.,

$$(G_{ETC})_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} (G_{ETC})_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} (G_{ETC})_3 \xrightarrow{M_3} \cdots \tag{91}$$

the hierarchy of E.T.C. gauge boson masses can be used to arrange for the hierarchy of fermion masses. In Eq. (85) the heavier E.T.C. bosons could be used to give masses to the lighter fermions, and the lighter E.T.C. bosons to give mass to the heavier fermions,for example, $m_t \simeq \Lambda_{TC}^3/M_{\rm lightest}^2$. In order to avoid FCNC when the bound in Eq. (88) is violated, one must postulate that E.T.C. interactions couple the fermions of different generations to different Technifermions (so, for example u couples only to Q_1, c to Q_2, t to Q_3, etc.). Thus one needs a T.C. model with at least three Technigenerations.

Precision tests at LEP constrain T.C. models, by its radiative effects in the propagator of the electroweak gauge bosons[29]. Models with QCD-like weak-isospin preserving T.C. dynamics with one whole family of Technifermions have been ruled out for all T.C. groups, ($N_{TC} \geq 2$). Only a smaller number of Technifermions, may be a single doublet of colour singlet Techniquarks U, D, are still allowed[29] in models of this type. Models with non-QCD- like dynamics, such as "walking" T.C. and "strong E.T.C." models, may allowed[30]. In particular, one- Technifermion-family models with weak isospin splitting and Techniquark-Technilepton splitting due to QCD and E.T.C. interactions, may be allowed[31]. However, it is difficult to reliably estimate the radiative effects in such models, precisely because one cannot use analogies with QCD[32].

So, there are still hopes for T.C., but no realistic theory is in sight. Anyhow, T.C. predicts many bound states of Technifermions at scales above $\Lambda_{TC} \simeq 0.5\,TeV$ that should be seen at SSC/LHC energies and many light ones. For example, a Technirho $T\rho$ should have a large coupling to a pair of Technipions $T\pi$, $T\pi \rightarrow T\rho$. The $T\pi$ are "eaten up" by the W and the Z, thus $T\rho$ should appear as a resonance in WW, WZorZZ scattering. Other pseudo- Nambu- Goldstone bosons may be very light, $m \simeq O(100)\ GeV$ or lighter. In fact, unsuccessful searches for these light bosons at LEP constrain many T.C. models.

5. Top quark condensate

Because the top quark mass is almost as large as the Technifermion masses, the E.T.C. bosons in "strong E.T.C." models couple strongly not only to Technifermions but also to t quarks, and may generate $\bar{t}t$ condensates, in the same way they originate $\bar{F}F$ condensates. Having this in mind, we could ask ourselves if it would be possible to eliminate the Technifermions and have the dynamical breaking only through $< \bar{t}t > \neq 0$. The answer seems to be, yes. Top quark condensate models[33,34] assume that some heavy bosons of mass Λ, exchanged between t-quarks, generate, at low energies an effective four fermion interaction

$$\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda^2}(\bar{Q}_L t_R)(\bar{t}_R Q_L) \quad . \tag{92}$$

At scales $\mu << \Lambda$, $\phi = (\bar{t}_R Q_L)/\Lambda^2$ becomes a composite Higgs field with V.E.V. $< \phi > = < \bar{t}_R Q_L > /\Lambda^2 \neq 0$ and a mass M_H not very different from the t-quark mass. The S.M. is obtained as a low energy effective theory at $\mu << \Lambda$ [34],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff} = \lambda_t \bar{Q}_L t_R \phi + h.c. + \cdots + |D_\mu \phi|^2 + m^2 \phi^+ \phi - \frac{\lambda}{2}(\phi^+ \phi)^2 + O(\frac{1}{\Lambda^2}) \tag{93}$$

but with the compositeness boundary conditions

$$\lambda_t(\mu), \lambda(\mu)\Big|_{\mu \to \Lambda} \to \infty \tag{94}$$

that show that new physics comes into play at $\mu \simeq \Lambda$. For $\Lambda = 10^{17}\ GeV$ [34], one obtains $m_t = 220\ GeV$, $m_H = 250\ GeV$. Such a high value of Λ implies fine tuning and no possibility of experimentally testing the compositeness scale. For low values of Λ, that could be tested experimentally, one gets much larger t-masses. For example, $m_t = 450\ GeV$ and $m_H = 600\ GeV$, for $\Lambda = 10\ TeV$ [34]. In any case the values of m_t obtained exceed present upper bounds.

These predictions have been criticized[35] because other higher dimensional terms (besides $\bar{Q}t\bar{t}Q$) may appear in the non-renormalizable Lagrangian, Eq.(92). These terms may alter the predictions so much that predictivity is lost.

Also the idea of condensates of the quarks (t', b') of a 4th. family has been considered[34]. Some of the results of these models are (for $m_t' = m_b'$): $m_t' = 200\ GeV$ and $m_H = 240\ GeV$ for $\Lambda = 10^{17}\ GeV$, $m_t = 400\ GeV$ and $m_H = 400\ GeV$ for $\Lambda = 10\ TeV$, and $m_t = 1\ TeV$ and $m_H = 2\ TeV$ for $\Lambda = 2\ TeV$. The main predictions are: no light Higgs field and a 4th. family of quarks that should be seen at LHC/SSC. There are again some problems in model building: complicated models to avoid FCNC and the need for four-fermion operators again.

6. Supersymmetry

Supersymmetry [11] ensures that there are bosons and fermions, supersymmetric partners of each other, that differ only in the spin. A supersymmetric generator Q has spin 1/2, since applied to a boson state $|b>$ gives a fermion $|f>$ and vice versa,

$$Q|b>= |f>\ ,\quad Q|f>= |b>\ . \tag{95}$$

In $N = 1$ supersymmetry there is only one generator Q, thus a fermion-boson pair (b, f) form a supersymmetric multiplet. Q, that is a fermion, satisfies the anti-commutation relations

$$\{Q, \bar{Q}\} = 2\gamma^\mu P_\mu\ , \tag{96}$$

where P_μ is the generator of space-time translations, $P_0 = H$, $P_i = \vec{p}_i$. Eq. (96) tells us that the anti-commutator of two global supersymmetric transformations constitute a translation in space time, identical at any space-time point because the transformations are global. If the two supersymmetric transformations are local, i.e. space-time dependent, its anti-commutator gives a local translation. A local translation in a fixed reference frame, can also be understood as a local coordinate transformation at a fixed point (either an observer is moving in a fixed reference frame, or the observer is at rest but the frame moves). Thus, invariance under local supersymmetry implies invariance under general space-time coordinate transformation (i.e. general relativity). Since, local supersymmetry incorporates gravity, it is called supergravity[16].

In $N = 1$ supersymmetry there is one "sparticle" for every particle. The minimal number of independent degrees of freedom in a fermion (a Weyl fermion) is two. Thus the minimal supersymmetric multiplet involves a complex scalar field and Weyl spinor. Examples are: $(\nu_L, \tilde{\nu}_L)$, i.e. left-handed neutrino and left-sneutrino, $(e_L, \tilde{e}_L)$ and $(e_R, \tilde{e}_R)$, i.e. electron and selectron. "Left" and "right" indices applied to scalars indicate that their fermionic partners are left or right-handed. The fermionic partners of bosons are called "...ino". For example, $\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{G}, \tilde{H}$, are called photino, W-ino, Zedino, gluino and Higgsino.

Supersymmetry is not a good symmetry, since we know of no degenerate boson-fermion pair. As mentioned earlier, Eq. (71), if supersymmetry is to explain the stability of the weak scale against radiative corrections the mass difference between supersymmetric partners should be

$$m_{\text{sparticle}} - m_{\text{particle}} \leq O(1\ TeV)\ . \tag{97}$$

There is another rule that early model builders discovered: no known particle can be the sparticle of any other. Thus, the sparticles must all be new particles (see Table 2.))

Table 2. Spin of the sparticles corresponding in $N = 1$ supersymmetry to the known particles.

Particle		**Sparticle**	
$S = 0$	Higgs (H)	$S = 1/2$	Higgsino ($\tilde{H}$)
$S = 1/2$	fermion	$S = 0$	sfermion
	$(\ell_{L,R}\ ,\ \ q_{L,R})$		$(\tilde{\ell}_{L,R}\ ,\ \ \tilde{q}_{L,R})$
$S = 1$	gauge bosons	$S = 1/2$	bosino
	$(\gamma,\ Z,\ W,\ gluon)$		$(\tilde{\gamma},\ \tilde{Z},\ \tilde{W},\ \tilde{g})$
$S = 2$	graviton	$S = 3/2$	gravitino

Supersymmetry and gauge invariance insure that for every vertex of particles, there must be the corresponding ones with sparticles. So, for example, to $\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$ correspond $\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow \tilde{e}^+e^-, e^+\tilde{e}^-$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \tilde{e}^+\tilde{e}^-$. The conservation of lepton and baryon numbers, L and B, usually require discrete symmetries, the most common of which is R-parity[36]. It is defined for each particle or sparticle as

$$R = (-1)^{3(B-L)+2S} \tag{98}$$

what means $R = +1$ for a particle and $R = -1$ for a sparticle. R-conservation has two very important consequences:

- sparticles are produced in pairs
- the lightest sparticle (the LSP, lightest supersymmetric particle), is stable; usually it is a neutral particle that escapes detection in collider experiments.

Thus, while R-parity is conserved the signature for supersymmetry in colliders is, precisely, supersymmetric particles produced in pairs that end-up producing missing energy and momentum. One should keep in mind that R-parity could be slightly violated, either explicitly[37], or spontaneously through a non zero V.E.V. of a sneutrino, $< \tilde{\nu}_\tau > \neq 0$[38]. This violation would have interesting experimental consequences[39].

Supersymmetry allows for the coupling of three multiplets such as the Yukawa coupling QD^cH, for example, but not of multiplets and complex conjugates of multiples, such as $QU^cH_1^c$ (this is not allowed). Thus, we cannot use just one Higgs field to give mass to all fermions, as we do in the S.M. (where we use ϕ for the up-fermions and its conjugate $\tilde{\phi}$ for the down-fermions, Eq.'s (58) and (62)). We need two Higgs doublets H_1 and H_2, to give mass to the down-fermions and to the up-fermions, respectively. Anomaly cancellation also requires two Higgs multiplets. There are eight real components in two complex doublet Higgs fields. Through the Higgs mechanism three of them are "eaten up" by the $W^\pm$ and Z^0. Five remain as physical particles: $H^\pm, h^0, H^0, A^0$. Thus, there are more Higgses than in the S.M. to look for, two charged ones and three neutral ones.

After many attempts to build phenomenologically viable supersymmetric models, those with supergravity spontaneously broken at a large energy scale, close to the Planck mass M_P, have been proven to be the best. Supergravity is broken by fields in a "hidden" sector of the theory, i.e. by fields coupled only gravitationally to the standard sector. The spontaneous breaking of supergravity produces a non zero mass for the gravitino, $m_{3/2} \neq 0$, and/or gauginos, $m_{1/2} \neq 0$. At low energy scales (in the limit $M_P \to \infty$, with $m_{3/2}$ and $m_{1/2}$ fixed), what remains is a theory with supersymmetry explicitly broken by "soft" breaking terms, i.e. terms with mass dimension 2 and 3. Since the mass dimension of a bosonic field, b, is 1 and that of a fermion field, f, is 3/2, the terms with dimension 2 and 3 are of the form

$$b^\dagger b,\ b^2,\ b^3, \bar{f}f\ . \tag{99}$$

Supersymmetry is broken by all possible gauge invariant terms of these types. From terms $\tilde{q}^\dagger\ \tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{\ell}^\dagger\ \tilde{\ell}$, we get large masses for the $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{\ell}$, $m_{\tilde{q}} > m_q$, $m_{\tilde{\ell}} > m_\ell$; from terms of the form $\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}$, etc.,we get large masses for all the gauginos, $\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{W}^\pm, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{g}$;

besides, we get all other possible quadratic and cubic couplings among scalars. Notice the amazing property of these models: the explicit supersymmetry breaking terms provide large masses only for the sparticles. While the gauge symmetry is unbroken, the masses of the standard particles, quark, leptons and gauge bosons, are zero. These particles get masses, due to the Higgs mechanism, only when the Higgs fields develop non-zero V.E.V.'s. Thus, these models have to incorporate a mechanism to get non-zero V.E.V.'s for the Higgs fields, $< H_i >= v_i \neq 0$, and not for other scalars, such as $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{\ell}$, $< \tilde{q} >=< \tilde{\ell} >= 0$.

6.1. The Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (M.S.S.M)

The M.S.S.M.[40, 41] is the simplest phenomenologically acceptable supersymmetric version of the S.M. The model has $N = 1$ supersymmetry spontaneously broken at large energies $\simeq M_P$ by a "hidden" sector, and supersymmetry broken by "soft" terms, as explained above. The M.S.S.M. has several additional defining properties[40].

1) At the TeV energy scale the symmetry group is that of the standard model, $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ (models with additional symmetries, such as an extra $U(1)$ for example, are non minimal).

2) There are no new matter fields besides the standard quarks and leptons and their corresponding supersymmetric partners, the sleptons and squarks.

3) The Higgs sector contains just two doublets H_1, and H_2, the first coupled to the down fermions and the second coupled to the up ones (therefore, after the electroweak symmetry breaking, there are three neutral and two charged physical Higgs bosons in the model; models with more Higgs fields are non-minimal).

4) Simplifying assumptions leave only five parameters in the Lagrangian, at the scale of Grand Unification, in addition to those of the S.M. The Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\rm SUSY} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm SUSY\ breaking} \tag{100}$$

has a supersymmetry breaking part

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm SUSY-breaking} = & \sum_i m_{0_i}^2 |\phi_i|^2 + \sum_\alpha M_\alpha \psi_\alpha \psi_\alpha + \\ & + \sum_\lambda A_\lambda \lambda \phi^3 + B\mu H_1 H_2 + \sum_\delta B_\delta \delta \phi^2 + h.c.\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

where i labels all scalars, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$, labels the three gauginos, λ labels all cubic coupling constants, μ is a supersymmetric mass term for the Higgs fields and δ labels other quadratic coupling constants. The constants $m_{0_i}, M_\alpha, A_\lambda, B, B_\delta$ depend on the "hidden sector". In the M.S.S.M. it is assumed that at a large scale M_U (that could be a Grand Unification scale):

$$m_{0_i}\Big|_{M_U} \equiv m_0 \quad , \quad M_1\Big|_{M_U} = M_2\Big|_{M_U} = M_3\Big|_{M_U} \equiv m_{1/2}, \quad A_\lambda\Big|_{M_U} \equiv A, \quad B_\delta\Big|_{M_U} \equiv B \quad . \tag{102}$$

Thus, The M.S.S.M. has five parameters (besides those of the S.M.). They are m_0, a common mass for the scalars, $m_{1/2}$, a common mass for the gauginos, μ, a supersymmetric mass term for the Higgs fields, and two adimentional parameters, A and B. Many times there is a further reduction of the number of parameters. Two of the most used choices are either $B = A-1$, an older choice, or $m_{1/2}^2 >> m_0^2$, $A^2 \simeq 0$ and $B^2 \simeq 0$, a "string inspired" choice[42].

The theory has to be scaled down, from the GUT scale to low energies, according to the renormalization group equations. Through radiative corrections, the Higgs masses become negative. Thus, the Higgs fields develop non-zero vacuum expectation values, $< H_1 >= v_1$ and $< H_2 >= v_2$, while the other scalar fields do not, $< \tilde{q} >=< \tilde{\ell} >= 0$. This is a nice feature of the M.S.S.M. This property is due to the effect of the heavy top quark, that couples to H_2, driving its mass negative. A correct spontaneous breaking of the standard model implies two minimization conditions, that reduce the five parameters mentioned above to just three independent parameters. They can be chosen to be a gaugino mass, for example M_2, the Higgs mass parameters μ, and the mass of the lightest scalar Higgs field, m_h. M_1, M_2 and M_3 are the masses of the three gauginos, the supersymmetric partners of the $U_Y(1), SU_L(2)$ and $SU_C(3)$ gauge bosons respectively. This masses, assumed in the M.S.S.M to be all identical to $m_{1/2}$ at the scale M_U (Eq. 102) get renormalized to

$$M_3 = (\alpha_s/\alpha) \sin^2\theta_W \ M_2 = (3\alpha_s/5\alpha) \cos^2\theta_W \ M_1 \ , \tag{103}$$

i.e. $M_3 \simeq 4M_2 \simeq 8M_1$, at the weak scale ($\alpha_s$ is the strong coupling constant, α the electromagnetic coupling constant, and θ_W is the weak mixing angle).

It is the assumption of equal gaugino masses at a unification scale, that allows translating the CDF lower bound on the gluino mass M_3, into a lower bound of $10-20$ GeV for the lightest neutralino mass, since this mass depends on M_1, and M_2. Not making this assumption leads to a non-minimal model[43] where neutralinos may be lighter than 10 GeV.

The M.S.S.M. incorporates the simplest viable assumptions, however, one or several of them may be proven wrong. We can keep the M.S.S.M. as long as it works, and we do not have better motivations to study more complex models. Some possible departures from the M.S.S.M. have been explored: models with broken R-parity, i.e. with L or B violations (so the lightest sparticle is not stable and sparticles are not produced in pairs)[37, 38, 39], models with extended Higgs sectors (for example, with one extra singlet[44]), models with non universal supersymmetric breaking terms (in which the assumptions in Eq.(102) are modified[43]).

6.2. Charginos and Neutralinos in the M.S.S.M.

In the M.S.S.M. there are four "neutralinos", two neutral gauginos $\tilde{W}_3$ and $\tilde{B}$ (the supersymmetric partners of the 3rd. $SU(2)$ gauge boson, W_μ^3, and the $U(1)$

gauge boson, B_μ, see Eq.(34) and two neutral Higgsinos, $\tilde{H}_1^0$ and $\tilde{H}_2^0$ (the partners of the neutral components of the two Higgs doublets). In the base $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}_3, \tilde{H}_1^0, \tilde{H}_2^0)$, their four by four mass matrix is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & -M_Z c_\beta s_W & M_Z s_\beta s_W \\ 0 & M_2 & M_Z c_\beta c_W & -M_Z s_\beta c_W \\ -M_Z c_\beta s_W & M_Z c_\beta c_W & 0 & -\mu \\ M_Z s_\beta s_W & -M_Z s_\beta c_W & -\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{104}$$

with the abbreviations c_β, s_β, c_W and s_W for $\cos\beta, \sin\beta, \cos\theta_W$ and $\sin\theta_W$, respectively. Here $\sin^2\theta_W = 0.23$ and $\tan\beta \equiv v_2/v_1$. M_1 is related to M_2 through Eq.(103). There are four mass eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in order of increasing mass), that are in general a linear combination of different current eigenstates (photino, Zino and Higgsino). In many models, the lightest neutralino is the LSP, the lightest supersymmetric particle, and one of the preferred D.M. candidates. It is in general

$$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 = \gamma_1 \tilde{\gamma} + \gamma_2 \tilde{Z} + \gamma_3 \tilde{H}_1^0 + \gamma_4 \tilde{H}_2^0 , \tag{105}$$

where the coefficients γ_i depend only on M_2, μ and v_2/v_1. When $M_2 \to 0$, the $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is the photino $\tilde{\gamma} = \cos\theta_W \tilde{B} + \sin\theta_W \tilde{W}_3$, with mass proportional to M_2. When $\mu \to 0$, the $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is the Higgsino $\tilde{h} = \sin\beta \tilde{H}_1^0 + \cos\beta \tilde{H}_2^0$, with mass proportional to μ. A general $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ as in Eq.(105) is usually heavier than the pure $\tilde{\gamma}$ or $\tilde{h}$ (see Fig. 3.).

Fig. 3. Contour map of the mass of the lightest neutralino in GeV and its dominant component (in regions separated by dotted lines) in the (μ–M_2) plane, for $\tan\beta = 2$. [45]

In this model the mass of the lightest neutralino can be anything between zero and a few TeV. The upper bound is a matter of consistency with the motivation to introduce supersymmetry as a solution to the hierarchy problem, Eq.(97). When $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is much heavier than the Z-boson, it is a pure $\tilde{B}$ for $M_2 < \mu$, and a pure Higgsino for $M_2 > \mu$. This can be easily seen by setting $M_Z = 0$ in the matrix in Eq.(104). Usually, all parameters of the Lagrangian are taken to be real, neglecting possible small CP violation effects. Without loss of generality, M_2 is chosen non-negative. A correct electroweak breaking requires $v_2/v_1 > 0$. For a heavy top, $m_t \geq$ 120 GeV, a value as large as 20 for this ratio may be allowed.

The "chargino" masses depend on the same three parameters, M_2, μ and v_2/v_1. The charginos are the two Dirac fermion mass eigenstates. They are linear combinations of the $\tilde{W}^-$, the $\tilde{W}^+$, the $\tilde{H}_1$ and the $\tilde{H}_2^+$. These are the superpartners of the $W^\pm$ gauge bosons, and of the charged components of the two Higgs fields.

The mass matrix of the charginos in the base $(\tilde{W}^+, \tilde{H}_2^+, \tilde{W}^-, \tilde{H}_1^-)$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & M_2 & M_W\sqrt{2}c_\beta \\ 0 & 0 & M_W\sqrt{2}s_\beta & \mu \\ M_2 & M_W\sqrt{2}s_\beta & 0 & 0 \\ M_W\sqrt{2}c_\beta & \mu & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{106}$$

There are two chargino mass eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_i^\pm$, $i = 1, 2$.

6.3. Sparticle Searches

At e^+e^- colliders, bounds have been obtained from the non-observation of Z boson decays into sparticle pairs, $\tilde{\ell}^+\tilde{\ell}^-$, $\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$, $\tilde{q}\tilde{\bar{q}}$, $\tilde{\chi}^+\tilde{\chi}^-$, $\tilde{\chi}_i^0\tilde{\chi}_j^0$. Both, direct searches and indirect limits from partial decay widths, give roughly a bound $\tilde{m} > m_Z/2$ for all sparticles, with two exceptions: the lightest neutralino, $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, and a light stop, $\tilde{t}$, because mixing effects can decouple them from the Z. Usually the squark masses are given by $m_{\tilde{q}_{L,R}} = |m_0 \pm m_q|$, with m_0 a common scalar mass (see Eq. (102)). Because m_t is large, $m_{\tilde{t}} = m_0 - m_t$ can be small. The lower bound on $m_{\tilde{t}}$ is 20 GeV[46, 41]. The lightest neutralino mass is larger than 20 *GeV* as soon as $v_2/v_1 > 3$, [47] and bounds on charginos and neutralinos can be seen in Fig. 4. (taken from Ref. 48). It is interesting to point out that the M.S.S.M. is as good as the S.M. with respect to bounds coming from precision measurements at LEP[49].

The bounds from $p\bar{p}$ colliders are better for strongly interacting sparticles. These particles are produced in pairs $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{q}\tilde{q}$, $\tilde{q}\tilde{g}$. Their production rate is relatively model independent. The signatures depend on the relative masses. If $m_{\tilde{g}} < m_{\tilde{q}}$, then squarks decay first, $\tilde{q} \to q\tilde{g}$, and one searches for gluino decays, $\tilde{g} \to \bar{q}q\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, $\bar{q}q'\tilde{\chi}_j^+$. If $m_{\tilde{q}} < m_{\tilde{g}}$ instead, gluinos decay first, $\tilde{g} \to \tilde{q}\bar{q}$, and one searches for squark decays $\tilde{q} \to q\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, $q'\tilde{\chi}_j^+$. In both cases it is important to include "cascade" decays[50], in which heavier neutralinos and charginos can be produced and decay into lighter ones. The inclusion of “cascade” decays has recently led to a revision of the CDF bounds on $m_{\tilde{q}}$ and $m_{\tilde{g}}$,[51]. The signatures are missing energy and equal sign dileptons or diquarks. Equal sign difermions are due to the Majorana nature of $\tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, that are their own antiparticles. Thus, the same decay products are possible on both sides of the produced pairs.

Fig. 4. Contour map of the mass of the lightest neutralino (dotted lines) and chargino (dashed lines) in GeV, showing present limits (shaded area) and future sensitivity of the complete LEP and Tevatron programs (solid lines), in the $(\mu - M_3)$ plane (where $M_3 = m_{\tilde{g}}$), for $\tan\beta = 2$. [48]

The lightest neutralino as the LSP, either light or heavy as compared with the weak gauge bosons, is one of the theoretically better motivated and testable D.M. candidates. Unless a very odd origin of the neutralino relic density is invoked, such as a late decay of gravitinos, for example, the relic density of neutralinos is determined by the same parameters $(M_2, \mu, v_2/v_1, m_h, etc)$[45, 52, 53], that determine the experimental bounds. In Fig 5. (taken from Ref. 53) we see in gray the regions of the (μ, M_2) parameter space for which the M.S.S.M. lightest neutralino with $m_{\tilde{\chi}_i^0} < m_W$ could account for the D.M., having a relic density $0.25 < \Omega h^2 < 0.5$ [53]. The regions rejected by LEP and CDF are also shown. As explained above, the CDF bound on gluinos can be translated into a bound on $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, because of the assumption of equal gaugino masses at a high energy scale M_U.

Fig. 5. Contour of relic LSP neutralino density in the $(\mu - M_2)$ plane, for $\tan\beta = 2$ and the indicated choices of other parameters. The calculation includes radiative corrections to the Higgs masses (see below). For neutralinos with $m_{\tilde{\chi}_i^0} < m_W$ this figure shows regions with $0.25 < \Omega h^2 < 0.5$ (shaded), where the neutralino is a good D.M. candidate, regions excluded because $\Omega h^2 > 1$ (coss-hatched) and regions excluded by LEP and CDF. The $\Omega h^2 = 0.1$ and $\Omega h^2 = 0.025$ contours are shown as a thick dashed and solid lines respectively [53].

For neutralinos much heavier than the gauge bosons, only the regions with $M_2 \simeq \mu$ for which $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$ is a mixed gaugino - Higgsino state yield densities suitable for a D.M. candidate[54]. For $M_2 > \mu$, where the lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$is a pure Higgsino, the density is too low , $\Omega h^2 < 0.001$, because of the fast Higgsino annihilation $\tilde{H}\tilde{H} \rightarrow W^+W^-$, in the early universe. For $M_2 < \mu$, where $\tilde{\chi}_i^0 = \tilde{B}$, a bino, the relic density is too large $\Omega h^2 > 1$, because the dominant annihilation mode, $\tilde{B}\tilde{B} \rightarrow HH$, has a very small cross section. Thus, bounds on the present total energy density of the universe exclude this region.

b *6.4. Higgses and Top in the M.S.S.M.*

As we mentioned above there are five physical Higgses (besides those "eaten up" by gauge bosons), two charged ones, $H^\pm$, and three neutral ones, h and H^0

that are CP-even fields, and A, that is CP-odd. At tree level, all the Higgs masses depend on only two parameters, usually chosen to be m_A and $\tan\beta = v_2/v_1$, and one can prove the following relationships

$$m^2_{H^\pm} = m^2_W + m^2_A \tag{107}$$

$$m^2_h + m^2_{H^0} = m^2_A + m^2_Z \tag{108}$$

$$m_W, m_A < m_{H^\pm}\ , \quad m_h < m_A < m_{H^0}\ . \tag{109}$$

Combining Eqs. (109) and (108), we obtain $m_{H^0} > m_Z$ and $m_h < m_Z$. That is, the tree level relations predicts that the lightest neutral Higgs field, h, is lighter than the Z. After radiative corrections, mainly due to t and $\tilde{t}$ loops[55], the upper bound on the lightest Higgs increases to

$$m_h < \ 150\ GeV\ . \tag{110}$$

Thus the prediction of a “light” Higgs in the M.S.S.M. persists [56, 41] (see Fig.6, taken from Ref. 56).

Fig. 6. Contours of the maximum value of m_h, the lightest Higgs mass, for $m_A >> m_Z$ and $\tan\beta >> 1$, in the $(m_t,\, m_{sq})$ plane[56].

The supersymmetric prediction of a light Higgs persists even in non-minimal models. For example, in the minimally non-minimal supersymmetric standard model, M.N.M.S. S.M.[44] in which a singlet Higgs field is added to the M.S.S.M. one obtains after including radiative corrections[57]

$$m_h < \ 140 \ GeV \ . \tag{111}$$

With respect to the t quark, typical values of the unification scale, $M_U \ \simeq 10^{16} \ GeV$ and of the sparticle masses $\tilde{m} \ \simeq \ G_F^{-1/2}$ give an upper bound [41]

$$m_t \ \leq \ 200 \ GeV \ \sin\beta \ . \tag{112}$$

7. Grand Unified Theories

GUT's attempt a "true unification" of strong and electroweak interactions into a single simple non-Abelian gauge group G, with a unique coupling constant g. The GU symmetry should break down spontaneously into the S.M. symmetry in one or several stages. We will talk here about "vertical" Grand Unifications that do not attempt to provide an explanation for the existence of more than one family. Families still appear as replicas - as they do in the S.M. "Vertical" unification means "intra-family" unification. The name stems from our habit of writing families in columns.

Within the S.M. there is no explanation for the values of the electrical charges of quarks and leptons, since they depend on the arbitrary choice of hypercharges Y. In a GUT, we expect the choice of the values of Y to depend on other quantum number assignments in G. Thus we expect to explain why a proton and an electron have equal (and opposite) charges to at least one 1 part in 10^{21}, i.e. $Q_u = -(2/3)Q_e$ and $Q_d = (1/3)Q_e$.

We also expect some other free parameters in the S.M. to become related to each other, thus reducing the number of parameters.

In GUT's, quarks and leptons are members of the same multiplet of G, thus GU interactions can change one into the other, violating B and L. A process such as $qq \rightarrow \bar{\ell}\bar{q}$, for example, mediated by a heavy gauge boson X of mass M_X, would induce proton decay, $p^+ \rightarrow e^+\pi^0$, with a rate

$$\Gamma \ \simeq \ \frac{g^4}{M_X^4} \ m_p^5, \tag{113}$$

where $m_p \simeq 1 \ GeV$ is the proton mass, and the factor m_p^5 is just a reasonable guess to obtain the proper dimension for Γ. From this rough estimate and the experimental bound on p-decay, $\tau_p \geq \ 10^{33}y$, [58] we obtain

$$M_X \ \geq \ 10^{14} - 10^{15} \ GeV \ . \tag{114}$$

It is remarkable that when the three running coupling constants of the S.M. are normalized with a common convention, their logarithmic behavior draws them together at approximately the same scale of Eq. (114). In fact, the running coupling constants of the S.M. at one loop, when measured at specific values of momentum transfer Q are given by

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(Q^2) = \alpha_i^{-1}(\Lambda_i^2) + \beta_i \, \ell n\Big(\frac{Q^2}{\Lambda_i^2}\Big) \ , \qquad (115)$$

where $\alpha_i = g_i^2/4\pi$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ refer to the $U_Y(1)$, $SU_L(2)$ and $SU_c(3)$ couplings respectively, $\beta_3 = (33 - 4N_G)/12\pi$, $\beta_2 = [(21/2) - 4N_G]/12\pi$, and $\beta_1 = (-0.3 - 4N_G)/12\pi$ and N_G is the number of generations. Taking a common scale $\Lambda_i = M_X$ where we assume $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3$, and subtracting Eq. (115) for two of the constants, we obtain $M_X/Q \simeq O[exp(\alpha_i^{-1} - \alpha_j^{-1})]$. That provides again the estimate in Eq. (114) for the "unification scale" M_X.

Since, as we mentioned above, the rank of the S.M. gauge group is 4, the rank of the G.U. group G must be larger than or equal to 4. The simplest rank-4 group that allows for a chiral embedding of the S.M. (where right and left handed fields are treated differently), i.e. that possesses complex representations, is $SU(5)$.

7.1. The $SU(5)$ model [12, 4]

The fundamental representation has dimension 5, and the $n^2 - 1 = 24$ generators T^a can be written as 5×5 matrices. These matrices contain the eight 3×3 matrices $(\lambda^a/2)$, generators of $SU_C(3)$, the three 2×2 matrices $(\tau^i/2)$, generators of $SU_L(2)$ and a diagonal generator corresponding to $U_Y(1)$, in the following way:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda^a/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad I_i \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau^i/2 \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad I_0 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} D_A & 0 \\ 0 & D_B \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad (116)$$

where $a = 1, \cdots 8$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$, D_A is a 3×3 diagonal matrix with elements A, D_B is a 2×2 diagonal matrix with elements B, and $A = -2/\sqrt{60}$, $B = -(3/2)A$ (notice that the condition in Eq. (28), with $r = 1/2$, is satisfied) . Besides these generators, there are two sets of six matrices that have non-zero elements in the 2×3 and 3×2 horizontal and vertical blocks not occupied in the matrices in Eq. (116), - which makes $8 + 3 + 1 + 6 + 6 = 24$. Notice that there are only four diagonal matrices (since the rank is 4), that correspond to $\lambda^3, \lambda^8, \tau^3$ and I_0. A gauge field multiplies each of the 24 generators in the covariant derivative (Eq's (23) and (34)): gluons G_μ^a multiply $\lambda^a/2$, weak gauge bosons W_μ^i multiply $\tau^i/2$, B_μ to I_0, and twelve new gauge bosons, the "lepto-quarks" $X_\mu, \bar{X}_\mu$ and $Y_\mu, \bar{Y}_\mu$ multiply the 12 generators in the non-diagonal blocks. The matrix $(\sum_b T^b A_\mu^b)$, b= 1,2,$\cdots$,24, in the $SU(5)$

covariant derivative (Eq. (23)), that consequently appears in the couplings of the $SU(5)$ gauge bosons A^a_μ with fermions, is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\mu + AB_\mu & G_\mu & G_\mu & \bar{X}_\mu & \bar{Y}_\mu \\ G_\mu & G_\mu + AB_\mu & G_\mu & \bar{X}_\mu & \bar{Y}_\mu \\ G_\mu & G_\mu & G_\mu + AB_\mu & \bar{X}_\mu & \bar{Y}_\mu \\ X_\mu & X_\mu & X_\mu & (W^3_\mu/2) + BB_\mu & (W^+_\mu/\sqrt{2}) \\ Y_\mu & Y_\mu & Y_\mu & (W^-_\mu/\sqrt{2}) & (-W^3_\mu/2) + BB_\mu \end{pmatrix} . \tag{117}$$

We use only left-handed spinors, f_L and $(f^c)_L$, as independent fields (as explained following Eq. (20)). The 15 Weyl spinors of each generation are accommodated in the representation $\bar{5} + 10$, without requiring any extra field,

$$\bar{5} : \begin{pmatrix} d^c_r \\ d^c_y \\ d^c_b \\ e \\ \nu_e \end{pmatrix}_L = f_{\bar{5}} \qquad 10 : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^c_b & -u^c_y & -u_r & -d_r \\ -u^c_b & 0 & u^c_r & -u_y & -d_y \\ u^c_y & -u^c_r & 0 & -u_b & -d_b \\ u_r & u_y & u_b & 0 & -e^c \\ d_r & d_y & d_b & e^c & 0 \end{pmatrix}_L = f_{10} \tag{118}$$

where r, y, b stand for the three colours, red yellow and blue.

From Eqs. (117) and (118) we see that the lepto-quark gauge bosons are those that couple leptons and quarks. These are the bosons whose mass, M_X, must fulfill the bound in Eq. (114). This mass arises due to the spontaneous breaking of $SU(5)$ into the S.M. group at the large scale M_X. This breaking is achieved with a Higgs boson Φ in the representation 24. This is the same representation of the gauge fields, so we choose to write Φ as a 5×5 matrix. The minimum of the potential determines a non-zero V.E.V., $< \Phi >$, which we are free to choose as a diagonal matrix (through $SU(5)$ notations),

$$< \Phi > = v_\Phi \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3/2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{119}$$

This V.E.V. is left invariant by $SU_C(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)$ transformation, i.e. it commutes with their generators given in Eq. (116). But this V.E.V. is not invariant under any other transformations, i.e., it does not commute with the other 12 generators, which are, therefore, spontaneously broken. Thus, we obtain masses for the X and Y leptoquarks.

$$M^2_X = M^2_Y = \frac{25}{8} g^2 v^2_\Phi \quad . \tag{120}$$

Thus, Eq. (114) implies $v_\Phi \geq 10^{14}\ GeV$. We have also to introduce another Higgs field, H, in the representation 5, and arrange its coupling to Φ so that when Φ has its V.E.V. at $<\Phi>$, Eq. (119), H has its V.E.V. at

$$<H>=\frac{v_H}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\0\\0\\1\end{pmatrix}\ . \qquad (121)$$

The lower two components of H act as the standard doublet Higgs field. Thus $<H>$ induces the electroweak symmetry breaking, $M_{Z,W} \sim v_H$ and $v_H \simeq 10^2\ GeV$. A fine tuning of coupling constants is necessary to obtain $v_H << v_\Phi$. This is the gauge hierarchy problem which we explained above.

7.2. Predictions of the $SU(5)$ model

The electromagnetic charge, Q, is a generator of $SU(5)$. As such $TrQ = 0$, i.e. the sum of the charges Q over any representation must be zero. For example, applying this requirement to the $\bar{5}$ in Eq. (118), one obtains

$$3Q_{d^c} + Q_e = 0\ . \qquad (122)$$

Thus $Q_e = -1$ implies $Q_{d^c} = 1/3$, hence $Q_d = -1/3$, and since $Q_u = Q_d + 1 = 2/3$, we obtain charge quantization, i. e., $Q_p = 2Q_u + Q_d = 1$.

Let us call I_3 the 5×5 matrix in Eq. (116) that contains $\tau^3/2 = T_3$, the third generator of $SU_L(2)$. Then $Q = T_3 + Y$ translates in $SU(5)$ into

$$Q = I_3 + cI_0\ , \qquad (123)$$

where c is a constant. Thus $Y = cI_0$. The difference between Y, the standard $U_Y(1)$ generator, and I_0, the corresponding $SU(5)$ generator, is due to the different normalization of both generators: I_0 must have the same normalization as I_3,

$$Tr(I_3^2) = Tr\ (I_0^2)\ =\ r\ , \qquad (124)$$

according to Eq. (28), while the normalization of Y and T_3 are independent. We can compute, the constant c using the generators in any representation, for example the $\bar{5}$ in Eq. (118). The generator Y applied to it, is

$$Y_{\bar{5}}\ =\ \begin{pmatrix}1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/2 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/2\end{pmatrix}\ . \qquad (125)$$

Plugging $Y_{\bar{5}}$ (Eq. (125)) and I_0 (Eq. (116)), in the relation $Y = cI_0$, we obtain $1/3 = cA = c(-2/\sqrt{60})$, thus

$$c = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}} \ . \tag{126}$$

In each covariant derivative, the corresponding coupling constant multiplies each gauge boson and generator. The terms containing the bosons W^3_μ and B_μ in the covariant derivatives of $SU(5)$ and $SU(2) \times U(1)$ (Eq. 34) must coincide at the unification scale M_X:

$$g(M_X) \ \ I_3 W^3_\mu + g(M_X) \ \ I_0 B_\mu = g_2(M_X) \ \ I_3 W^3_\mu + g_1(M_X) \ \ Y B_\mu \ \ . \tag{127}$$

Notice that the $SU(5)$ expression has a unique coupling $g(M_X)$. From Eq. (127) we get $g(M_X) = g_2(M_X)$ and, using $Y = cI_0$,we get $g(M_X)c = g_1(M_X)$. Consequently, using the value of c in Eq. (126), we obtain

$$\frac{g_1^2(M_X)}{g_2^2(M_X)} = \frac{3}{5} \ . \tag{128}$$

Since $\sin^2\theta_W \equiv g_1^2/(g_2^2 + g_1^2)$, at the unification scale M_X we have

$$\sin^2\theta_W \bigg|_{M_X} = \frac{c^2}{1+c^2} = \frac{3}{8} \ . \tag{129}$$

We can convince ourselves that this prediction is common to all GUT's for which the fermions only include the standard fermions of one generation (plus possibly singlets of the S.M. group). This is because the equality $Tr(I_0^2) = Tr(I_3^2)$ holds in any GUT (Tr indicates the sum over all fermions in one family). Thus, summing the hypercharges and the third isospin components of all the fermions in one standard family, i.e. $\sum_f Y_f^2$ and $\sum_f I_3^2$, we can compute the ratio

$$\frac{Tr(Y^2)}{Tr(I_0^2)} = \frac{Tr(Y^2)}{Tr(I_3^2)} = \frac{\sum_f Y_f^2}{\sum_f I_3^2} = \frac{5}{3} \ . \tag{130}$$

Since at the scale M_X we have $g_1^2 Tr(Y^2) = g_2^2 Tr(I_0^2)$ (Eq. (127)), we obtain again Eq. (128) and thus the prediction in Eq. (129).

In order to compare the prediction in Eq. (129) with the measured value of $\sin^2\theta_W$ one has to renormalize the coupling constants from M_X to M_Z. One obtains [59],

$$\sin^2\theta_W \bigg|_{M_Z} \simeq 0.207 - 0.213 \ , \quad M_X \simeq (2-7)\ 10^{14}\ GeV \ , \tag{131}$$

both too low to be acceptable. The present value of $\sin^2\theta_W$ is $\simeq 0.23$, and the actual calculation of the proton life time gives [4]

$$\tau_{p\to e^+\pi^0} \;\simeq\; 10^{31\pm 0.7} y \;\left(\frac{M_x}{4.6\times 10^{14}\; GeV}\right)^4 \;, \tag{132}$$

which combined with the experimental bound, $\tau_{p\to e^+\pi^0} > 10^{33} y$, [58] yields $M_X > 1.5\; 10^{15}\; GeV$.

The fermion masses come from the Yukawa couplings of $f_{\bar 5}$ and f_{10} (Eq. (118)) with the Higgs field H. For each generation, these couplings are,

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \lambda_1 \bar f_{\bar 5\alpha} f_{10\alpha\beta} H_\beta + \lambda_2 \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon} f_{10\alpha\beta} f_{10\delta\gamma} H_\epsilon \tag{133}$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon = 1,2,3,4,5$. Replacing H by $<H>$ (Eq. (121)), one gets

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm mass} \;\simeq\; \lambda_1 v_H(\bar d d + \bar e e) \;+\; \lambda_2 v_H(\bar u u) \tag{134}$$

for each generation. Thus, at the scale M_X, one predicts

$$m_d = m_e \;,\quad m_s = m_\mu \;,\quad m_b = m_\tau \;. \tag{135}$$

The renormalization of the Yukawa couplings change these ratios. The prediction [60, 4]

$$\frac{m_b}{m_\tau} \;=\; 2.8 \;-\; 2.9 \;, \tag{136}$$

is considered a success, but the ratios m_s/m_μ and m_d/m_e fail.

Because of the bounds on $p-$decay, $\sin^2\theta_W$ and fermionic mass ratios, the minimal $SU(5)$ model presented here is considered to be ruled out. So we need to go to more complicated models with larger symmetries and/or more fields. One of the ways of enlarging the symmetry is to include supersymmetry.

7.3. Supersymmetric GUT's

Precision measurements at LEP have shown that the standard model coupling constants, when extrapolated to higher energies without introducing any new physics, do not meet at one point[59, 61]. This is additional evidence of the failure of simple GUT's as the minimal $SU(5)$ model. The same calculation in the M.S.S.M. (instead of the S.M.) shows that the three couplings do meet at one point, at a unification scale $M_X \simeq O(10^{16} GeV)$, large enough to suppress proton decay mediated by the exchange of lepto-quark gauge bosons[59, 61]. Notice that the extrapolation of coupling constants from M_Z to M_X is independent of the GU model, since all fields with mass $\sim M_X$ drop out of the renormalization group equation. This extrapolation depends only on the low energy spectrum, and the simplest viable low energy supersymmetric model is the M.S.S.M.

Also the prediction for $\sin^2\theta_W$ is better. Recall that starting from 3/8 at the unification scale, the renormalized value of $\sin^2\theta_W$ at the M_Z scale is too low, when the low energy spectrum is that of the S.M. With the M.S.S.M. spectrum instead, the prediction is compatible with the experimental data[59, 61]. These arguments by no means "prove" supersymmetry, since similar results can be obtained in non-supersymmetric GUT's, as we will see below. However, they support the idea of supersymmetry.

There are some potentially serious problems in supersymmetric GUT's. The renormalization of the m_b/m_τ ratio in minimal models, starting from 1 at the GUT scale, leads to the very good prediction [60] $m_b = 4.9 \pm 0.1\ GeV$, but again, other fermion mass ratios fail. Another potentially serious problem is proton decay mediated by "dimension 5 operators"[62]. While the high value of M_X yields a safe value for the p-lifetime due to the exchange of lepto-quarks, the exchange of squarks and gauginos/Higgsinos in a box diagram is dangerous. The B-violating operator,

$$\mathcal{L}_{d=5} = \frac{\tilde{q}\,\tilde{q}\,q\,\ell}{M_X}\ , \tag{137}$$

couple two bosons, two squarks, with two fermions, a quark and a lepton, through the exchange of a fermion, a heavy coloured Higgsino of mass M_X. The mass dimension of these operators is $d = 5$ (1 for each boson and 3/2 for each fermion). The box diagram that mediates p-decay through $qq \to \bar{q}\bar{\ell}$, consists of $qq \to \tilde{q}\tilde{q}$ (through the exchange of a light gaugino) and $\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \to \bar{q}\bar{\ell}$ $\big($through the coupling in Eq. (137)$\big)$. The exchange of lepto-quark gauge bosons induces p-decay with a lifetime $\tau_p \sim M_X^{-4}$, while the exchange of a coloured Higgsino (a fermion) yields a much shorter lifetime $\tau_p \sim M_X^{-2} << M_X^{-4}$. Thus, one predicts

$$\tau_{p\to\bar{\nu}K^+} \simeq 10^{29\pm4} y\ , \tag{138}$$

quite low compared with the experimental lower bound of $10^{33}y$. Therefore, this decay mode provides strong constraints on many supersymmetric models, and excludes some of them[63].

There are already models in which the B-violating $d = 5$ operators, Eq. (113), are absent. This is the case of the "flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)$" model[64]. This is not truly a G.U.T., since the gauge group $SU(5) \times U(1)$ is not a simple group. The matter fields in this model are:

$$(\bar{5}, -3/2) : \begin{pmatrix} u^c \\ u^c \\ u^c \\ \nu \\ e^- \end{pmatrix}_L ; \qquad (10, 1/2) : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d^c & -d^c & d & u \\ -d^c & 0 & d^c & d & u \\ d^c_y & -d^c & 0 & d & u \\ -d & -d & -d & 0 & \nu^c \\ -u & -u & -u & -\nu^c & 0 \end{pmatrix}_L ; \tag{139}$$

$$(1, 5/2) : e^c ; \qquad (1, 0) : N\ .$$

Here the colour indices have been neglected, the first number in the parenthesis indicates the representation of $SU(5)$ and the second the $U(1)$ charge. Notice that the assignments of u and d and those of ν and e, have been "flipped" with respects to the assignments in $SU(5)$ GUT, Eq. (118). One needs an extra lepton, N, and four Higgs multiples, $\Phi, \bar{\Phi}, H$ and $\bar{H}$, in the representations $(10, 1/2), (\bar{10}, -1/2), (5, -1)$ and $(\bar{5}, 1)$ respectively, to break spontaneously the symmetry. In this model, the $d = 5$ operators in Eq. (137) depend on the existence of a mixing between the coloured components of H and $\bar{H}$ (that we call H_c and $\bar{H}_c$). Actually, they depend on the mixing of their supersymmetric partners, the Higgsinos $\tilde{H}_c$ and $\tilde{\bar{H}}_c$. In this model, there is a mechanism that insures that the coloured Higgs fields in H and $\bar{H}$ are heavy, while the non coloured ones remain light (and constitute the standard doublet Higgs field). It happens that this mechanism also suppresses the $\tilde{H}_c-\ \tilde{\bar{H}}_c$ Higgsino mixing, and thereby avoids the danger of p-decay through $d = 5$ operators.

As we mentioned above, the confluence of the three coupling constants at one point is not proof of supersymmetry, since it can be also achieved in non-supersymmetric GUT's with intermediate breaking scales. Let us mention $SO(10)$ models with two breaking scales: M_U, the usual unification scale, and M_I, another intermediate scale [59, 65]. At M_U the $SO(10)$ group breaks into a left-right symmetric group, either

$$SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times SU(4) \ , \tag{140}$$

or

$$SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U_{B-L}(1) \times SU_C(3) \ , \tag{141}$$

that break into the S.M. at the scale M_I. The correct value of $\sin^2\theta_W$ and a safe p-lifetime can be obtained with $M_U \simeq 10^{16} GeV,\ M_I \simeq 10^{12}\ GeV$ for the first case, Eq. (140), or $M_U \simeq 10^{16}\ GeV,\ M_I \simeq 10^{10}\ GeV$ for the second case, Eq. (141).

$SU(10)$ models [66, 4] fit the 15 Weyl spinors of a whole standard fermion family, into a representation of dimension 16. Thus, an additional particle, a right-handed neutrino, must be added. These models, therefore, have naturally a "see-saw"[23] mechanism to produce neutrino masses. This mechanism is based on the fact that a mass matrix of the form

$$(\overline{\nu_L} \quad \overline{\nu^c{}_L}) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu^c{}_R \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{142}$$

with $M >> m_D$, has one light eigenvector, mainly ν_L, with mass m_D^2/M, and a heavy eigenvector, mainly ν_R, with mass M. M is a ν_R Majorana mass, $M\ \overline{\nu_L^c}\nu_R$, and m_D is a Dirac mass, $m_D\ \overline{\nu_L}\nu_R = m_D\ \overline{\nu^c{}_L}\nu^c{}_R$. With three generations, each fermion in Eq. (142) becomes a vector of three components, m_D and M become 3×3 matrices, and the 6×6 mass matrix has six eigenvectors, (usually) three light and three heavy,

$$\frac{m_{D1}^2}{M_1},\ \ \frac{m_{D2}^2}{M_2},\ \ \frac{m_{D3}^2}{M_3},\ \ M_1, M_2, M_3\ . \tag{143}$$

There are many different versions of this mechanism. For example, the Dirac masses m_{Di} could be similar to the up-quark masses, or to the charged lepton masses (or even something different). The neutrino mass hierarchy depends on this choice since $m_t/m_c \simeq 100$ while $m_\tau/m_\mu \simeq 17$. In a "quadratic see-saw", the three heavy masses M_i are similar, i. e. $M_i \simeq M$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Consequently, the hierarchy of light neutrino masses is that of m^2_{Di}, i.e. $m_{\nu_1} : m_{\nu_2} : m_{\nu_3} \simeq m^2_u : m^2_c : m^2_t$ (or $m^2_e : m^2_\mu : m^2_\tau$). In a "linear see-saw", the hierarchy of the heavy masses M_i coincides with that of m_{Di}, i.e. $M_1 : M_2 : M_3 \simeq m_u : m_c : m_t$. As a consequence, also the ratio of light neutrino masses is linear in m_D.

$SO(10)$ models with intermediate scales M_I, naturally have the heavy Majorana masses at M_I, $M_i \simeq M_I \simeq 10^{10-12}\ GeV$. As a result they easily accommodate the MSW [67] solution to the solar neutrino problem, that requires $|m^2_{\nu_i} - m^2_{\nu_e}|^2 \simeq 10^{-6}\ eV$ [21], by yielding $m_{\nu_e} << m_{\nu_\mu} \simeq 10^{-3} eV$. In this case, the value of m_{ν_τ}, that could also have important implications, depends on the type of see-saw. In quadratic see-saw models one may obtain $m_{\nu_\tau} \simeq 10\ eV$, so that ν_τ could be a good D.M. candidate. In linear see-saw models one may obtain $m_{\nu_\tau} \simeq\ 10^{-1} eV$, a good value for solving the "atmospheric neutrino problem" [22], (a deficit of ν_μ with respect to ν_e in cosmic rays) through $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations .

8. Brief Comment on Composite Models [68]

The basic idea is that a few fundamental particles may form bound states only in allowed configurations, i.e., the combinations of colour, charge, etc. of the S.M. particles. In particular, excitations of the fermionic bound states would explain the existence of more than one family. There is an obvious problem in considering quarks and leptons as bound states, namely their masses are much smaller than their inverse radii. This is contrary to all bound states we know. For example, $(g-2)$ measurements give an upper bound of $10^{-19} cm$ to the size of electrons, thus:

$$m_e \simeq 0.5 MeV << 10^{19} cm^{-1} \simeq 10^3 TeV \simeq \Lambda_H\ . \tag{144}$$

Here Λ_H is the scale of the confining force "hypercolour", that binds the components, the "preons". Eq. (144) shows that the origin of the radii (the confinement scale Λ_H) and the origin of masses m must be different. When bound states form, at the energy scale Λ_H, some of them must remain massless due to a symmetry (usually chiral symmetry)[69] that is spontaneously broken at a lower scale m, at which masses appear, $m << \Lambda_H$. If a chiral symmetry is present among bound states, it must be also present among preons that, therefore, must be massless. Consequently, we have massless fermions forming massless composites. 't Hooft [69] has formulated an important constraint on composite models often called 't Hooft's "anomaly matching condition". It states that for chiral symmetry to be unbroken in the formation of composites (so producing massless bound states), it is necessary that the anomalies of axial currents must be the same when computed using both sets of massless fermions, i.e., preons and bound states. This is not an easy condition to fulfill, since preons and bound states usually are different in number and belong to different representations. Realistic models [70] are very complicated and lack predictivity.

Composite gauge bosons should reproduce with extreme accuracy the relations between different couplings found in gauge theories. This is very difficult. The cancellations of different diagrams that insures unitarity in processes such as $e^+e^- \to W^+W^-$, give good bounds on possible departures from a gauge structure. Moreover, if W and Z are composites one expects to find also excited states, $W', W'', \cdots$ and $Z', Z'', \cdots$. We would need a mechanism to insure that only the lightest bound states have masses $M_{W,Z} << \Lambda_H$, otherwise the values of $\sin^2\theta_W$ and the ρ-parameters should depart from the S.M. As the experimental agreement with the S.M. improves, there is progressively less room for composite W and Z bosons 68.

9. Acknowledgements

I thank the organizers of the Lake Louise Winter Institute for the opportunity to participate in such a pleasant school. This work was supported in part by the DOE under grant DE-FG03-91ER 40662 Task C.

10. References

1. S. L. Glashow, Nucl. Phys. 22 (1961) 579; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, (1967) 1264; A. Salam, *Proceedings of the 8th. Nobel Symposium*, Ed. N. Swartholm (Stockholm, 1968).

2. D. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30 (1973) 1343; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31 (1973), 494; H. Fritzsch, M. Gell-Mann and H. Leutweyler, Phys. Lett. 47B (1973) 365.

3. J. Bjorken and S. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, 1964).

4. For reviews see P. Langacker, Phys. Rep. 72 (1981) 185; *Nith Worshop on Grand Unification* ed. R. Barloutaud (Worl Scientific, Singapore, 1988) p. 3; G.G. Ross, *Grand Unified Theories* (Benjamin, New York, 1984); R. N. Mohapatra, *Unification and Supersymmetry* (Springer, New York, 1986,1992).

5. R. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977) 1440 and Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 1791; F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 279; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 223.

6. M. Gell-Mann, California Inst. of Technology Syncrotron Lab. Report N^o CTSL -20 (1961) (reprinted in M. Gell-Mann and Y. Ne'eman, *The Eightfold Way* (Benjamin, New York, 1964); Y. Ne'eman, Nucl. Phys. 26 (1961) 222.

7. Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 4 (1960) 380; J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cimento 19 (1961) 154.

8. P. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 12 (1964) 132 and Phys. Rev. l45 (1966) 1156; F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 321; G. Guralnik, G. Hagen and T. Kibble, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 585.

9. M. Kobayashi and M. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. 49 (1973) 652.

10. L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 2619; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1976) 974, Phys. Rev. D 19 (1979) 1277; for reviews see, for example E. Fahri and L. Susskind, Phys. Rep. C 74 (1981) 227; S. King, *Beyond the Standard Model* (Carleton Univ., Ottawa, June 1992), CERN-preprint-TH. 6617/92)

11. D. Volkov and V.P. Akulov, Phys. Lett. 46B (1973) 49; J. Wess and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B 70 (1974) 39. See for example, P. Fayet and S. Ferrara, Phys. Rep. C32 (1977); J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity* (Princeton U. Press, 1983).

12. H. Georgi and S. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32 (1974) 438.

13. S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B193 (1981) 150; N. Sakai, Zeit. fur Phys. C11 (1982) 153.

14. F. Wilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 421.

15. See for example J. Bagger, S. Dimopoulos and E. Masso, *Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics* (Leipzig, Germany, 1984) Vol. 1, 12.

16. E. Cremmer at al., Phys. Lett. 79B (1978) 23 and Nucl. Phys. B147 (1979) 105; See for example P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rep. 32C (1977) 189; P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. 110C (1984) 2; Wess and Bagger in Ref.11.

17. See, for example, E. Kolb and M. Turner, *The Early Universe* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA. 1990) and references therein.

18. See, for example, D. Bennett et al. (MACHO collaboration),*16th. Texas Symposium, TEXAS-PASCOS 92* (Berkeley,1992)

19. K. Olive, D. Schramm, G. Steigman and T. Walker, Phys. Lett. B236 (1990) 454.

20. J. Ellis, D. Nanopoulos, L. Roszkowski and D. N. Schramm, Phys. Lett. B245 (1990); L. Krauss, YCTP-P4-91 (1991) and YCTP-P36-91 (1991); L. Roszkowski, Phys. Lett. B278 (1992) 147.

21. See, for example, S.A. Bludman, N.Hata D.C. Kennedy and P.G. Langacker, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 2220.

22. K.S. Hirata et al., Phys. Lett. B280 (1992) 146; R. Becker-Szendy et al., Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 3720.

23. M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, *Supergravity* (ed. F. Van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) p. 315; T. Yanagida *Proc. of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Decay in the Universe* (KEK, Japan, 1979), Prog. Theo. Phys. B135 (1978) 66.

24. S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, Nucl. Phys. B 155 (1979) 237; E. Eichtein and K. Lane, Phys. Lett. 90 B (1980) 237.

25. B. Holdom, Phys. Rev. D24 (1981) 1441; Phys. Rev. Lett. B150 (1985. 301.

26. W. Bardeen, C. Leung and S. Love, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 (1986) 1230; T. Appelquist, D. Karabali and L. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 957; T. Appelquist and L. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. D 35 (1987) 774 and Phys. Rev. D 36 (1987) 568.

27. For a review see, for example, T Appelquist, YCTP-P23-91, published in *Proc. of Particles, Strings and Cosmology* (Boston 1990) p.315.

28. T. Appelquist, T. Takeuchi, M. Einhorn and L. Wijewardhana, Phys. Lett. B 220 (1989) 223; B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B 236 (1990) 327.

29. M. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 964 and Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 381; J. Ellis, G. Fogli and E. Lisi, Phys. Lett. B 274 (1992) 454.

30. T. Appelquist and G. Triantaphyllou, Phys. Lett. B 278 (1992) 345; R. Sundrum and S. Hsu, Nucl. Phys. B 391 (1993) 127.

31. T. Appelquist and J. Terning, Yale U. preprint YCTP-P7-93, April 1993.

32. R. Chivukula, M. Dugan and M. Golden, Phys. Lett. B 292 (1992) 435 and Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 2930; T. Appelquist and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 3075.

33. Y. Nambu, *New Theories in Physics*, Proc. XI Warsaw Symposium on Elementary Particle Physics (ed. Z. Ajduk et al., World Scientific, 1989); V. Miransky, M Tanabashi and Y. Yamawaki, Phys. Lett. B 221 (1989) 177 and Mod. Phys. Lett. A4 (1989) 1043.

34. W. Bardeen, C. Hill and M. Lindner, Phys. Rev. D41 (1990) 1647.

35. M. Suzuki, Mod. Phys. Lett. A5 (1990) 1205; S. King and S. Mannan, J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 4949; A. Hasenfratz et al., Nucl. Phys. B365 (1991) 79.

36. G. Farrar and P. Fayet, Phys. Lett. 76B (1978) 575; G. Farrar and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D27 (1983) 2732.

37. L. Hall and M. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. B 231 (1984) 419; R. Barbieri et al., Phys. Lett. B 238 (1990) 86.

38. C. Aulak and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Lett. 119b (1983) 136; G. G. Ross and J. Valle, Phys. lett. 151B (1985) 375; J. Ellis et al., Phys. Lett. 150B (1985) 142; J. Valle, Phys. Lett. B 196 (1987) 157; M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and J. Valle, Nucl. Phys. B 355 (1991) 330; A. Masiero and J. Valle, Phys. Lett. B 251 (1990) 273.

39. For a review see, for example, J. Valle, *Neutrino 92* (Granada, Spain, June 1992), CERN preprint TH.6626/92.

40. H. Haber and G. Kane, Phys. Rep. 117 (1985) 75; J. Gunion and H. Haber, Nucl. Phys. B 272 (1986) 1; R. Barbieri, Riv. Nuovo Cim. 11 (1988) No. 4.

41. For a recent review see, for example, F. Zwirner, *Texas/PASCOS Conference* (Berkely, Dec. 1992) and CERN-TH.6357/91.

42. J. Ellis and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B 338 (1990) 317.

43. K. Griest and L. Roszkowski, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 3309.

44. J. Ellis, J. Gunion, H. Haber, L. Roszkowski and F. Zwirner, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 844; R. Flores, K. Olive and D. Thomas, Phys. Lett. B 245 (1990) 509 and Phys. Lett. B 263 (1991) 263.

45. G. Gelmini, P. Gondolo and E. Roulet, Nucl. Phys. B 351 (1991) 623.

46. I. Adachi et al. (TOPAZ coll.), Phys .Lett. B 218 (1989) 105 and KEK-preprint -89-037 (1989).

47. D. Decamp et al (ALEPH coll.), Phys. Rep. 216 (1992) 253.

48. G. Ridolfi, G. Ross and F. Zwirner, *Proc. of the LHC Workshop* (Aachen, Germany, G. Jarlskog and D. Rein eds., Oct. 1992) Vol. II, p. 605.

49. J. Ellis, G. Fogli and E. Lisi, Nucl. Phys. B 393 (1993) 3.

50. H. Baer, X. Tata and J. Woodside, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 207.

51. F. Abe et al. (CDF coll.), Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 3439.

52. A. Bottino et al., Phys. Lett. B 265 (1991) 57; A. Bottino et al. Mod. Phys. Lett. A 7 (1992) 733.

53. J. Ellis and L. Roszkowski, Phys. Lett. B 283 (1992) 252.

54. K. Olive and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. B 230 (1989) 78; Nucl. Phys. B 555 (1991) 208; K. Griest, M. Kamionkowski and M. Turner, Phys. Rev. D 41 (1990) 3565; M. Kamonkowski, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 3021.

55. Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys. Lett. 85 (1991) 1; J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991) 83; H. Haber and R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 1815.

56. Z. Kunszt and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B 285 (1992) 3.

57. J.R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 266 (1991) 389, Phys. Lett. B 279 (1992) 92 and Phys. Lett. B 302 (1993) 51.

58. For a review see R. Barloutaud, *TAUP' 91* (Toledo, Spain, Sept. 1991), Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 28A (1992) 437.

59. P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 817; P. Langacker, UPR-0539-T, May 1992.

60. D. Nanopoulos and D. Ross, Phys. Lett. 108 B (1982) 351 and Phys. Lett. 108 B (1982) 99.

61. J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 249 (1990) 441; U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260 (1991) 447; F. Anselmo, L. Cifarelli, A. Peterman and A. Zichichi, Nuovo Cim. 104A (1991) 1817; P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 4028.

62. S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 26 (1982) 287; N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B 197 (1982) 533; S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. 112B (1982) 133; J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos and S. Rudaz, Nucl. Phys. B 202 (1982) 43.

63. See, for example, R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, *Lake Louise Winter Inst.* (Lake Louise, Canada, Feb. 1992), CTP-TAMU-39/92 and references therein; also Phys. Lett. B 299 (1993) 58 and CTP-TAMU-23-93.

64. S. Barr, Phys. Lett. B 112 (1982) 219, Phys. Rev. D 40 (1989) 2457; J. Derendinger J. Kim and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 139 (1984) 170; I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, J. Hagelin and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 194 (1987), Phys. Lett. B 231 (1989) 65; J. Ellis, J. Hagelin, S. Kelley and D. V. nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B 311 (1988) 1.

65. R.N. Mohapatra and M.K. Parida, UMD-PP-92-170 and Phys. Rev. D 47 (1992) 264.

66. H. Georgi, *APS Particles and Fields* (ed. C.E. Carlson, AIP, New York, 1975) p.575; H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Ann. Phys. 93 (1975) 193.

67. L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 25 (1978) 2369; S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Yad. Fiz. 42 (1985) 1441 (Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 42 (1985) 913).

68. For reviews see, for example, M. Peskin, *Proc. Int. Symposium on Lepton and Photon Interactions at Haigh Energy* (ed. M. Koruma and K. Takahashi, 1985); R. D. Peccei, *Proc. of the Lake louise Winter Institute*, (Lake Louise, Canada, 1987) p. 564, DESY-87-050 (1987). G. t' Hooft in *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories*, Cargese Lectures 1979, (eds. G. 't Hooft et al., Plenum, New York, 1980)

70. For a recent attempt see, for example, S. Yu. Khlebnikov and R. D. Peccei, UCLA-92-TEP-49 preprint (1992)